

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, March 24, 1908.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

## A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York offers as a matter of privilege the following.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 23, 1908, be corrected by striking out, on pages 3835, 3836, and 3837, the speech purporting to have been delivered March 18, 1908, by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and inserting in lieu thereof the transcript of the notes of the Official Reporters of the House of the speech actually made by said gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. SULZER. But I have the floor.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois—

Mr. MANN. I will withdraw the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, the resolution is offered for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has put in yesterday's Record a speech reflecting upon the intelligence of most of the Members of this House. The speech was never delivered, and he never uttered one single word of it on the floor of this House. The official stenographer's notes show that the gentleman got up on the 18th of March and asked "leave to extend his remarks." What remarks? [Laughter.] This morning, lo and behold, we found on the first page of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech by the "Hon. JOHN DALZELL, of Pennsylvania, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, March 18, 1908." And he says in this speech:

Indeed, I think it may be truly said that there are comparatively few Members of the House itself, much less outsiders, who have any real knowledge of the rules. The rules are simple enough and entirely logical, but to the majority of Members of the House who have no special ambition to familiarize themselves with them they seem complicated.

"Any real knowledge of the rules!" Now, think of that! Think of the gentleman from Pennsylvania slipping this undelivered speech into the Record and saying "Very few Members have any real knowledge of the rules." "The rules," he says, "are simple enough and entirely logical, but to the majority of the Members of the House who have no special ambition to familiarize themselves with them they seem complicated." Then the gentleman from Pennsylvania pays his respect to the newspaper reporters and magazine writers and some others "who, without unfairness, it may be said have very little knowledge or any conception of what they are writing about."

Think of that for an illustration of assumed wisdom.

This speech is not only a reflection on the intelligence and assiduity of the majority of the Members of this House, but reflects on the newspaper correspondents who sit in yonder gallery. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

A short time ago in the German Reichstag a member said something derogatory of the newspaper correspondents and they went on a strike, and now the world knows absolutely nothing about what the members of the German Reichstag are doing. If the gentlemen of the press gallery do not go on a strike to rebuke the gentleman from Pennsylvania I shall be very much surprised. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman got unanimous consent to extend his remarks, and I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will tell us what remarks he made. I hope the gentleman will consent, in all fairness, to strike out the derogatory parts of his speech reflecting on the Members of this House and on the newspaper correspondents.

This resolution is presented by me this morning to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] offered a resolution yesterday to strike out of the Record a part of my speech which I had actually delivered on the floor of the House, and I would have delivered all of it if I had been allowed the time, but I could not get the time, and under the circumstances did the best I could, and when my time was exhausted I asked the House for unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and the House granted it, and then the next day the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moved to strike out everything I did not actually say on the floor of the House.

Now, sir, I call the attention of the country to what I consider a great abuse of the rules and privileges of the House of Representatives, and that is the practice of putting into the Record speeches and data which have never been spoken, and never

been heard on the floor of the House. It is an abuse that should cease. Yesterday, sir, I served notice on the House that if the Republicans struck out a part of my speech, which reflected on nobody, which did nobody an injury, which simply narrated the record of this House, in future I would see to it that nothing went into the Record by unanimous consent, and I am doing this not alone to please myself but I am going to do it in the interests of the newspaper correspondents, in the interests of the official reporters of the House, and in the interests of public economy, so that the poor fellows down in the Government Printing Office will not have to work quite so hard; and I now reiterate that nothing hereafter will appear in the Record, so far as I am concerned, unless it is actually delivered on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SULZER. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. DALZELL. About three minutes.

Mr. SULZER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman. [Laughter.] I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, with respect to a portion of what the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] has said, I quite agree. I believe that the practice of printing in the Record speeches that were not delivered is a bad practice, and I shall agree to cooperate with the gentleman hereafter in suppressing that sort of literature. My speech, purported speech, in the Record this morning was put in there pursuant to leave granted by the House on the 18th of March, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show. It reflects on nobody and contains, as the House will observe, no little interspersed applause either on the Democratic or the Republican side. [Laughter.]

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I am content to take the judgment of the House on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. SULZER) there were—ayes 21, noes 131.

So the resolution was rejected.

## EFFICIENCY OF MEDICAL DEPARTMENT, UNITED STATES ARMY.

The Speaker laid before the House the bill (S. 1424) to increase the efficiency of the Medical Department of the Army, with House amendments thereto disagreed to by the Senate.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate bill and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The Chair announced the following conferees on the part of the House:

Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CAPRON, Mr. SLAYDEN.

## LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill be taken from the Speaker's table, that the House disagree to the Senate amendments thereto, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference thereon. Is there objection?

Mr. SULZER. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

## AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19158) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909. Pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, if I can have the attention of my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB], I would like to arrange, if I can, the time for general debate, and I will ask the gentleman whether four hours on a side would be satisfactory to him?

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, we would like very much to have more time, but in view of the fact that we must economize in time now we will have to consent, trusting to borrowing some time from the other side, and to getting what time we can have under the five-minute rule on this side.

Mr. SCOTT. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be limited to eight hours, to be divided equally between the majority and the minority, to be controlled by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB] and myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to eight hours, to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas and by the gentleman from Virginia. Is there objection?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to state that this is a most important bill, and there are a great many Members who desire to be heard in general debate, and when this important bill is taken up I see no reason why the debate should be limited to four hours on each side. It seems to me there ought to be at least three or four days of general debate; we ought to have at least eight or ten hours on each side. I will ask the gentleman if he could not agree to three days' general debate on the bill?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think my friend from Texas [Mr. HENRY] may perhaps rely upon the judgment of the ranking member of the minority of the committee, and since he has suggested that eight hours would be satisfactory, I hardly feel as if I could agree to a longer time.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I do rely upon the judgment of the gentleman, and dislike very much to take issue with him; but I know there are some gentlemen who desire to engage in general debate on this bill, and four hours will not be enough. There are a number of the members of the committee on the minority side who wish to make speeches, and this will not give them an opportunity.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to say to the gentleman from Texas that this matter has been pretty carefully canvassed, and I think eight hours will suffice for all gentlemen who wish to discuss the bill to be heard, and I desire to renew my request.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Well, unless the gentleman will agree to at least six hours on each side I shall feel constrained to object.

Mr. SCOTT. Then, Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that we go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 19158, the agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 19158, the agricultural appropriation bill, Mr. FOSTER of Vermont in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 19158, the agricultural appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 19158) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard, and the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk began the reading of the bill and read to page 6, line 6.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas renews his motion that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, in addition to the formal report which accompanies this bill, I desire, with the indulgence of the committee, to submit a few observations upon some special features of the bill and perhaps upon some of the work of the great Department for the support of which it is intended to provide.

First of all, I desire to correct an impression which seems to have become prevalent that the total amount carried by this bill is in excess of the estimates submitted by the Department. It is true that the Book of Estimates presents but \$10,666,351 as the estimates from the Department of Agriculture, but supplemental estimates were subsequently sent to the House which brought the total up to \$12,851,351. The present bill carries \$11,431,346, so that instead of being in excess of the estimates it is below them by \$1,420,005. The increase of this bill over the appropriations for the current year will be found less than the average increase during the past ten years, and your committee believes it is a thoroughly conservative and carefully drawn bill.

The report notes briefly the fact that the volume of the bill has been reduced from 69 to 49 pages. This reduction has been made by an elimination of redundant and unnecessary verbiage, and has not limited the scope of the work of the Department or changed its character in any degree. The changes have been made merely to simplify the bill so that its provisions may be more easily understood.

Your committee has recommended very few promotions in salary, and these only in exceptional and uncommonly meritorious cases.

Under the Weather Bureau the bill recommends the construction of a new building at Abilene, Tex.; Dodge City, Kans.; Richmond, Va.; East Lansing, Mich.; Northfield, Vt.; St. Joseph, Mo., and Fort Wayne, Ind. It also recommends the reestablishment of the station at Pikes Peak and restoration of the administration building at Mount Weather, which was destroyed by fire last October.

The recommendation for the construction of buildings at the various stations named is made in pursuance of what your committee believes to be the wise policy of the Bureau to house its employees in its own buildings as rapidly as these buildings can be economically constructed. The value of meteorological observations is greatly enhanced if they can be taken at the same place over a long period of years. Your committee believes it is good policy, therefore, to build permanent homes for the stations wherever the stations themselves are to be permanent.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is there any special construction that is necessary in these weather buildings that demand special quarters in order to have efficient service?

Mr. SCOTT. It is necessary, chiefly, that they should be located so as to be free from the influence of adjoining buildings, and it is necessary also that the roofs should be of such shape that instruments may be placed on them which will be easy of access by the observers in charge of the station.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give the committee roughly the number of stations which are located in rented quarters and the number that are in quarters owned by the Government?

Mr. SCOTT. I can not even approximate that, as the matter has never been brought to my attention. I may say it has been the policy of the Bureau for several years to construct these buildings, and the agricultural appropriation bill most of the time for the past six years, since I have had the honor of being on the committee, has carried appropriations for that purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. Aggregating how much in amount annually?

Mr. SCOTT. The cost of these buildings ranges from \$12,000 to \$15,000, and provision has been made—

Mr. STAFFORD. Independent of the sites?

Mr. SCOTT. Including the sites; and provision has been made in the different bills for sometimes four and sometimes eight buildings.

Mr. STAFFORD. What percentage are in Government buildings and what in rented quarters?

Mr. SCOTT. You mean in their own buildings?

Mr. STAFFORD. In the buildings owned by the Government.

Mr. SCOTT. I should think perhaps 20 per cent are in their own buildings.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give any rough estimate as to the amount of appropriation that would be needed in case they were housed in buildings owned by the Government?

Mr. SCOTT. Well, there are about 200 stations. It would cost about \$15,000 a station. About 70 or 80 per cent of them are as yet unsupplied, and the gentleman can make the computation himself.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it possible to have these stations located in the usual Government buildings such as we construct for use of post-offices and other governmental purposes?

Mr. SCOTT. The Chief of the Bureau does not recommend that, for the reason that the buildings are very seldom so constructed as to be suitable for the use of the Weather Bureau.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can not some quarters in those buildings be arranged whereby they would be suitable for the purposes of the Bureau?

Mr. SCOTT. I suppose, of course, if the matter were taken into account when they were constructed, it might be done, but, as the gentleman knows, the construction of the Weather Bureau buildings is under the control of the Department of Agriculture. Other public buildings are constructed by the Treasury Department, so that there has been no coordination of that sort.



Mr. STAFFORD. The purpose of my inquiry was that here we have these buildings being constructed under the Department of Agriculture, that has immediate charge of them, while the Government buildings that are mostly used for post-office purposes through the country are under the charge of the Treasury Department—

Mr. SCOTT. I may say to the gentleman—

Mr. STAFFORD. Over which the Post-Office Department has no control whatsoever, and wherein the buildings are erected without regard and oftentimes in opposition to the plans and recommendations and ideas of the Post-Office Department.

Mr. SCOTT. I may say to the gentleman that, as a general proposition, the Weather Bureau prefers to have its observers live in the stations, and of course that would be wholly impracticable in a post-office building.

In regard to the building at Mount Weather, Va., as Members of the House doubtless know, there has been established at that point a research station, the purpose of which is to carry on new and original investigations with a view to widening the realm of knowledge upon which the service of the Weather Bureau is based. Very little progress has been made in the science of meteorology for a great many years. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and we hear the sound thereof, but whence it cometh or whither it goeth" is about as much of a mystery now as it was when the Master talked with Nicodemus nineteen hundred years ago.

We are spending about a million and a half of dollars annually to make forecasts of the weather and distribute them, and yet if we can forecast the weather any more accurately now than twenty-five years ago it is chiefly because our agents have become more skilled in the application of the old principles and not because any new principles have been discovered. Your committee believes, therefore, that it is a good policy to spend a few thousand dollars each year in researches which may, we hope, broaden the science upon which the art of forecasting is based. Now, the station at Mount Weather consists of about half a dozen buildings, and the administration building, which was destroyed by fire last October, is an essential part of this plant. Your committee has, therefore, recommended an appropriation for its restoration.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to know how much of the \$1,500,000 would be expended for buildings.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, in the present bill there is carried an appropriation of \$60,000 for the restoration of this building at Mount Weather, and for a general power plant for that station, and then we have \$105,000 for buildings at other stations, making altogether \$165,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Do you not think that a great deal of this money could be saved by utilizing the post-office buildings in the various sections of the country, notwithstanding the fact that the Department thinks it advisable not to use them?

Mr. SCOTT. Why, no. I do not think it would be practicable. That matter has been canvassed frequently before the committee, and the committee has been unanimously of the opinion that the reasons given by the Bureau why that should not be done are satisfactory and conclusive.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman be kind enough to tell us what the reasons were?

Mr. SCOTT. One reason was that the post-office buildings are seldom located at the proper place. Frequently they are surrounded by higher buildings; they are right in the heart of the city; the architecture is not such as to make them convenient for the observers to place their instruments on the roof and take their observations. And still another reason is that it would be impossible to house the observer and his family in the post-office buildings, and that is almost essential in all the smaller stations where only one man is employed.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, I would like to ask why it is essential to house the observer in the building used by him?

Mr. SCOTT. Because he ought to be on duty twenty-four hours of the day.

Mr. MADDEN. Then, he is to be something like a Pinkerton detective that never sleeps?

Mr. SCOTT. He is to have an opportunity to sleep; but, like a physician, he is to be called up if the need arises.

In the Bureau of Plant Industry a rearrangement of the language has been made, by which the grain investigations heretofore carried as a separate item shall be covered into the general work of the Bureau, and new language has been inserted to provide that when fixed grades have been established they shall constitute the official standard for the grading of grain. Lack of uniformity in grain grading throughout the country has long been a subject of complaint, both by the producers and the purchasers of grain. Some three years ago, in consequence of these complaints, an appropriation was

inserted in the agricultural appropriation bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake an investigation, from which it was hoped a method would be devised for bringing about uniform grain grading. These investigations have not been entirely successful, but very encouraging progress has been made. A mechanical device has been perfected, by means of which the water content of grain, one of the most important factors in its grading, can be quickly and accurately determined, and this device is now in use in many of the great grain markets.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to ask if it is proposed to have the Federal Government assume jurisdiction of inspection over all the grain shipped in this country?

Mr. SCOTT. I would say to the gentleman that it is in the hope of preventing that very thing that your committee has recommended that this investigation be carried on. We believe that as a result of this investigation methods will be devised whereby a uniform system of grain grading may be established throughout the country, to be put into effect by the present boards of inspection, so that the Government will not be obliged to yield to the demand which the gentleman knows is becoming more and more insistent every year to undertake Federal inspection.

Mr. MADDEN. Just what has the Government done so far to secure information upon which to base inspections as to uniform grading of grain?

Mr. SCOTT. Well, I was just stating that as a result of these studies it has devised this mechanical apparatus for determining the water content of grain. It has made progress in the development of apparatus for testing other factors that enter into the grading of the grain, and it is believed by the officials in charge of the work that the problem ultimately will be solved.

Mr. MADDEN. There is no disposition to establish boards of inspection to take the place of the boards of inspection that exist now in the various cities?

Mr. SCOTT. There is no proposition to establish any board of inspection.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what I wanted to find out.

Mr. SCOTT. For a similar reason we have incorporated in this bill a new paragraph authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a standard for the different grades of cotton. To fix the standard of cotton is a much simpler thing than to determine the grade of grain, for the reason that it is largely a mechanical matter, depending on the length of the fiber, its color, luster, and so forth.

Nevertheless the number and names of the various grades in use in the cotton markets of the country have given rise to innumerable disputes between buyer and seller, so that both producers and manufacturers of cotton have earnestly appealed to your committee to authorize the Secretary to determine and declare what shall be the standard for certain grades of cotton named in the bill.

It is believed that when these grades have been fixed sets of actual samples can be prepared and sent out to the various markets, by means of which practical uniformity can be brought about throughout the entire country.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman allow a question or two?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I regard the provisions of the bill that the gentleman is now discussing as of very great importance indeed, and I have not as yet reached the conclusion that I shall support them when the bill is up for consideration. Now, in relation to the official standards of cotton, the gentleman has explained to the committee about the controversies which often arise between the shipper and the consignee, or the seller and the buyer, respecting the grading of cotton.

Will not substantially the same controversy arise as to whether the cotton shipped comes up to the official standard or goes below? Will it obviate in any considerable measure the differences of views and the controversies that exist between the seller and the buyer, by the fixing of an official standard, unless the Government proceeds to establish a tribunal that will inspect and determine the quality of every particular shipment of cotton? And does it not necessarily lead to Government inspection of cotton and all other kinds of commodities?

Mr. SCOTT. I think the controversies which arise under the present system are due chiefly to the great difference in the number and names of the grades of cotton at various markets. For instance, at the New Orleans market they may have only nine grades of cotton, in the New York market there may be thirty grades of cotton, and the difference in the names and the difference in the number of grades are so confusing that it is practically impossible to ship cotton from one of these markets to the other without creating a controversy. And it is the

judgment of this committee that, so far from leading the way to Federal inspection of all these commodities, the investigation called for in this bill, both as to grain and cotton, will go far to obviate the necessity of such Federal inspection.

We believe it will be possible, in the matter of cotton, as I suggested a moment ago, to make actual sets of samples to be sent out to the different markets, so that it will be as easy a matter to grade cotton as it would be to take a ribbon to a dry-goods store and match it. It may be that a similar system may be devised even in the matter of wheat, for I notice that in Canada, where they have government inspection, they send out to the different markets actual samples of wheat at the beginning of each season, which simply mark the grade that is to be given.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Now, just one suggestion. I am not very familiar with the cotton market or with the merchandizing of cotton, but I have supposed that all considerable sales were upon sample, and that an expert would know what cotton might be worth by an examination of the sample; and that whether it is graded officially or otherwise, he knows as a matter of fact what its inherent qualities are and what it is worth for working up into textile fabrics.

Mr. BURLERSON. If the gentleman will permit me, what he has said is largely true, but the difficulty is that in different sections the trade have different standards for the same grade of cotton. To illustrate my meaning, the standard at Atlanta for middling cotton may be entirely different from the standard used for middling cotton at Savannah, only a few miles removed. A great many of the controversies and contentions now constantly arising about the classification of cotton would be removed if we could provide a uniform standard for the different grades of cotton, and the very purpose of this amendment is to obviate the dangers alluded to which now threaten unless some such action as proposed by this amendment is taken. This will not lead to Federal inspection at all, and to no expense to the General Government. I want to say further to the gentleman from Indiana that upon the merits of this particular proposition there is no difference between the manufacturer and the grower, the consumer and producer. Even the cotton exchange element—the speculating element—agrees that this is very desirable reform as far as cotton trade generally is concerned.

Mr. KEIFER. Will the gentleman allow me to suggest that the same thing applies to the grading of wheat at different places? The same quality of wheat is differently classified at Chicago and Toledo, Ohio, places not far apart.

Mr. SCOTT. Emphasizing what I have already said, and confirming what has been said by the gentleman from Texas, I wish to assure the members of this committee that in the deliberate judgment of the Committee on Agriculture the provisions for the grading of wheat and cotton, if allowed to remain in this bill, will do more than any other one thing possibly can do to satisfy those who are now insisting upon the Federal inspection of these commodities.

Mr. REID. In what way would you enforce this statute?

Mr. SCOTT. There is no provision in the bill by penal statute or otherwise to enforce it. It is simply believed that if a standard can be determined the obvious advantage of it to all parties interested in dealing in this commodity will be so great that it will be adopted by mutual consent and will pass into the commercial practice of the country by what might be called the inductive method.

Mr. REID. In other words, it will be entirely voluntary by the parties contracting?

Mr. SCOTT. Entirely so. This cotton provision has been so earnestly appealed for by both the producers and manufacturers of cotton that I am sure the results brought about by the investigation will be welcomed by both parties.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On what page of the bill is the provision?

Mr. DRISCOLL. On page 16. I want to ask the gentleman from Kansas a question. Have they not got now the same grades under the same names that you propose here?

Mr. SCOTT. They have in some markets, and in other markets they have twenty or thirty other grades.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Your names do not mean anything; they are simply abstract names. Are you going to have samples also?

Mr. BURLERSON. They have the names now in use.

Mr. SCOTT. In some markets they have them. The proposition is to have actual sets of samples corresponding with the various grades named.

Mr. DRISCOLL. It strikes me that the abstract names are absolutely meaningless unless you have samples to represent those names; and if you have the samples, you must have somebody representing the Government to enforce a compliance by all the people dealing in cotton with those names, and it will

lead just as sure as the world to a force of Government employees to enforce the provision.

Mr. BURLERSON. The advantages will be so manifest to all parties interested that they will be glad to adopt it. There is not the least doubt about that.

Mr. DRISCOLL. While the gentleman from Texas is a believer in States rights on general principles, he is willing to get the Government to interest itself in and do things the people might otherwise do, and which the State might otherwise do, and I am inclined to think that this is only an entering wedge to get a corps of Federal employees to enforce this grading of cotton and other commodities on the people.

Mr. SCOTT. I think the gentleman is unnecessarily apprehensive in this matter. It will be a very simple thing for the Bureau employees at the beginning of each cotton season to prepare actual sets of samples and send them out to the various markets, and that is all that this paragraph proposes to do, and your committee believe all that will ever be necessary. It will not be necessary to send a Federal official along with these samples to see whether the cotton compares with them and is of a given grade or not. The samples will speak for themselves, and any man of average intelligence will be able to make the comparison.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Can not any cotton shipper produce his own samples, and can not any cotton buyer require that the bulk of the shipment shall come up to a given sample? If he has a sample that does not compare with any you name, can not he sell his cotton?

Mr. SCOTT. Undoubtedly. There is no suggestion in the bill of a limitation upon the right of private contract.

Mr. DRISCOLL. No man is required in selling cotton to name it, and he is not required to produce a sample that will meet any sample made by the Government. Therefore he must sell his crop by his own sample.

Mr. SCOTT. If that is true, no harm will be done, and I do not see that it argues particularly against the provision in the bill.

Mr. DRISCOLL. It strikes me as another Federal interference with the rights of private individuals in the transaction of their business.

Mr. SCOTT. There is no design to interfere with anybody's private rights, and in reply to the gentleman I want to say that I think his fears are groundless, and if he will study the question closer I think he will come to that conclusion himself.

Mr. BOUTELL. I would like to make a single inquiry in the interest of barley. Some very interesting work has been carried on during the past few years in making tests of barley and improving the quality of the seed. A great part of this work has been done in cooperation with the Government by the Wahl and Henins Institute of Fermentology, in my district. This work, as I understand it, has been very valuable not only to the farmers, but to the consumers of barley. I notice there is a little change in the phraseology of this bill, and the inquiry I wish to make of the chairman in charge of the bill is whether there is anything in the bill to preclude this work being done in the future.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois was perhaps not in his seat when I began my statement, and did not hear me say that the change which had been made in the volume of the bill did not involve any change in the scope of the Department's work. I remember the particular project to which he refers, and can say that the work will be carried on in the future as it has been in the past, under the general authority of the Department.

Mr. McMORRAN. Mr. Chairman, referring to the inspection of grain, establishing a standard, does not this paragraph on page 17 have for its intention the creation of a controversy between the boards of trade now established in this country and the buyer or seller?

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, on the contrary, the intention is and the hope of your committee is that it will do away with the controversies which now are frequently arising.

Mr. McMORRAN. As I understand the situation to-day, and from reading this paragraph, especially the latter part of it—

And also for the issuance of certificates of inspection when requested by the consignor or consignee of any grain entering into foreign commerce—

I understand there is some controversy at the present time by the foreign purchaser of grain in this country as to the inspection which he shall accept. As the matter stands to-day, if he buys in the Chicago market or Minneapolis or Duluth, he is obliged to take the inspection there established. Now, under this paragraph I understand that he could appeal to the Secretary of Agriculture, who could issue a certificate of inspection for that grain purchase.



Mr. SCOTT. Replying, let me say first that the precise language to which the gentleman now calls attention has been in this bill for three years. Those certificates have been granted for the past two years whenever asked for, and the gentleman has perhaps not heard of any controversies arising from that cause. It is true, as he states, that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction in foreign markets with the grades of grain that are supplied them from the United States. That dissatisfaction has been so great that we are largely losing our market for grain in Europe. In France, for example, we sell only 20 per cent of the corn imported, when we ought to sell 80 per cent, and the bulk of that trade goes to Argentina because the grading is done more accurately, at least, if not more honestly, in that country than it is in this. It is in the hope of changing those conditions or making it possible for an American certificate of grading to be taken at par in any market of the world that we have authorized this work to be done.

Mr. McMORRAN. I would like to say that, in my judgment, with thirty or forty years' experience with boards of trade, we have in this country, that there is no country on the face of the globe where there is a more fair or better average standard of inspection than there is in this country to-day. Referring to corn, corn has created a large controversy between the foreign buyer and the shipper on this side of the water. And why? Because there are certain seasons of the year when corn heats in transit. The buyer of that corn understands the situation fully, just as much as the seller does, and when he buys that corn he takes the risk, whatever it may be. What he is seeking to do is to get some temporary advantage of the American seller, so that when that corn arrives at the point of shipment, say at our Atlantic or Gulf ports, and is in a heated condition, he may have the opportunity to reject it and go back on the inspection on which he bought it.

Mr. SCOTT. It seems to me that the observation the gentleman has made hardly applies to the provision in this bill, as I do not see how the possession of a certificate of inspection by the Federal authorities could give a foreign buyer any undue advantage over an American seller, provided the American seller has honestly graded his grain in the beginning.

There is no purpose, absolutely, in the minds of your committee in authorizing this work to be done, except to bring about, as nearly as possible, a uniformity in the grading of grain throughout the markets of the United States, believing that such uniformity would be of immense advantage not only to producers of grain, but to the purchasers and dealers in grain.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to my colleague here, and in order to facilitate the business of the House, that all of these interrogatories only prolong this debate and consume the time. These gentlemen must know that when these paragraphs are reached under the five-minute rule, all of these important questions will be discussed. I do not see how the chairman can make his statement here, as I know he is well prepared to do, if he is to be fired with all these inquiries, and I appeal to the House to have patience and wait until this statement is made, and when these paragraphs are reached we will have full discussion of all these important subjects.

Mr. DRISCOLL. The chairman has made no appeal that he should not be interrupted—

Mr. LAMB. He is too modest, perhaps, to make it.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And we did not know he wished to be let alone.

Mr. LAMB. Then he is different from the rest of us. I think he is made of the same stuff that we are made of.

Mr. SCOTT. I appreciate the intercession of my friend from Virginia.

Mr. McMORRAN. I want to say to the gentleman this is one of the most important things concerning the large agricultural interests of this country, and I can not see for the life of me why the Secretary of Agriculture should attempt to create a controversy between our standard of inspection of the boards of trade, which they have agreed upon for grain, and foreign countries.

Mr. SCOTT. I am sure if the gentleman will confer with the Secretary of Agriculture he would learn it was far from his intent to create a controversy; and I would suggest, if he has not already done so, that he inform himself as to the work that has been done under this paragraph during the last two years. This is not new. There are only a dozen new words in this paragraph, the ones which relate to establishing a standard.

The work has been carried on for the last three or four years, and the fact that such troubles as the gentleman now seems to anticipate have not arisen during that time would seem to indicate they are not to be feared in the future.

Mr. McMORRAN. Do you understand the Government is to undertake an examination of this grain before shipment and before the issuance of the certificate?

Mr. SCOTT. I do not quite understand the question.

Mr. McMORRAN. In other words, take a cargo of corn from Chicago purchased by a foreign buyer. Is the Government to have inspectors stationed there to inspect that grain as well as the Chicago Board of Trade?

Mr. SCOTT. No; that is not the idea at all. The Government simply establishes laboratories at certain great grain centers and at some of the ports of the country to examine samples of grain that are brought to those laboratories, and the certificates set forth the condition of those samples. It is not the idea at all to have a force of Government inspectors at great elevators or in the railroad yards. They are stationed only in the laboratories where they grade the samples which are brought to them.

Mr. McMORRAN. Now, do you understand the Government at the present time has any laboratories that contain any machinery of any kind that will test the grain to any better advantage than our boards of trade at present have?

Mr. SCOTT. Well, as I stated a few moments ago, they have devised an apparatus for testing the water content of grain, which is so much better than anything heretofore in use that it is being rapidly adopted throughout the country.

Mr. McMORRAN. Is it not being adopted by the board of trade at Chicago?

Mr. SCOTT. Exactly; simply because it is better than anything the board of trade at Chicago has had.

Mr. McMORRAN. Has the Government anything better?

Mr. SCOTT. I say this is a device perfected by the Government, and it has been adopted by the board of trade at Chicago because it is better than what they had.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman just one question. I understood the chairman of the Agricultural Committee to state a few minutes ago that the United States sold only 20 per cent of the corn shipped to Europe.

Mr. SCOTT. To France.

Mr. MADDEN. To France—because the inspection of the grain or corn from the Argentine Republic was so much higher standard than the American inspection that the people of France accepted the Argentine Republic corn in preference to ours. Did I misunderstand him?

Mr. SCOTT. I think I made a statement substantially to that effect.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand there is no inspection whatever in the Argentine Republic on grain or meats or food products of any kind, name, or nature.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, that being true, it is an even greater reflection, I should say, upon the inspection in the United States that grain that comes from a country where there is no inspection at all sells in the market against ours.

Mr. MADDEN. In fact, they sell their grain and all food products for less money than we do, and that is the reason why they are able to get a foreign market in preference to us.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman probably knows (without wishing to protract this debate) that there has been recently held in London a congress of European buyers of grain called for the purpose of protesting against the inspection system of the United States, that the work of that congress has been called to the attention of the President, and that the Secretary of Agriculture has caused an investigation to be made to determine to what extent the complaints made by these European purchasers were correct. I would suggest that the gentleman might obtain some valuable information if he would look up the report of that congress.

Mr. KEIFER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask just one question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. With great pleasure.

Mr. KEIFER. I want to inquire whether the Committee on Agriculture have looked into the question of the power of Congress, under the Constitution, to fix a standard for grading grain, cotton, and so forth, and enforcing that in the country?

Mr. SCOTT. There is no proposition in this bill, Mr. Chairman, to enforce a standard. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] will doubtless remember that for a great many years the Bureau of Chemistry in the Department of Agriculture was authorized to establish standards for foods. There was no machinery of the law back of that authority to force the adoption of those standards, and yet, as a matter of fact, they were adopted throughout the country very largely by the State legislatures, which enacted laws to put them into effect. And that is what it is hoped may be accomplished in the matter of the establishment of standards for the grading of cotton and wheat; that after these standards have been established the various boards of inspection throughout the country, corporation and State, will be glad to have the standards, and by proper enactment will put them into effect in their own localities.

Mr. KEIFER. Will the gentleman allow me to suggest that the matter of pure food was a matter that related to the health conditions of the country, and the matter of fixing standards for the sale of grain, cotton, and so forth, is a different proposition altogether?

Mr. SCOTT. I only attempted to draw the parallel in this respect, that there was no attempt in this appropriation bill in former years to force these standards of foods upon the country, and yet they accomplished a great deal of good because they were taken up by the various State legislatures and enacted into law.

Mr. Chairman, another rearrangement of this bill has been made in the Bureau of Plant Industry, whereby the appropriation heretofore carried as a separate item to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the continuous spread of the Mexican cotton boll weevil has been covered into the general work of the Bureau, and the appropriation has been correspondingly increased.

In 1894 the Mexican cotton boll weevil crossed the border and invaded the State of Texas. For the next few years that State combated the pest with the best means at its disposal, but with so poor success that in 1905 an appeal came to Congress for an emergency appropriation to extend the aid of the General Government. It was represented, and very truly, that the weevil was spreading so rapidly as to threaten the actual extinction of the cotton-growing industry. Indeed so great had been its ravages that in some parts of Texas large areas of cotton plantations had been wholly abandoned. In 1905, therefore, Congress made an appropriation of \$250,000 to be expended in this work, carrying it on the bill as an emergency item. It has been carried in a similar way for the following three years, the amount having been reduced to \$190,000 each year. The present bill, as I have just stated, omits the item as an emergency, but makes provision for the continuation of the work. This change is recommended because the work has ceased to be an emergency and has settled down into what promises to be one of the regular tasks of the Department. The boll weevil has simply been added to our other insect pests, and the fight against it is another one of our continuing problems.

When the combat first began the attack was directed along two lines. The Bureau of Entomology took up the study of the life history of the weevil with a view to ascertaining whether parasites might not be introduced which eventually might serve to keep it in check, and also in the hope of being able to suggest to planters cultural or mechanical methods of resisting its ravages. The Bureau of Plant Industry assumed as its part of the contest the problem of selecting varieties of cotton that would either in themselves be resistant to the boll weevil or mature their crops early enough to escape its worst ravages. Along both of these lines of attack decided progress has been made. The entomologists have discovered several varieties of parasites which they think eventually will multiply sufficiently to materially retard the spread of the weevil, and they have also been able to do effective work in the way of quarantining new territory against the spread of the pest.

The most practical results, however, have been reached through the operations of the Bureau of Plant Industry. This Bureau has discovered some varieties of cotton which are strongly resistant to the boll weevil, the plants having the peculiar faculty of exuding a sort of gum when the egg is laid in the boll, which seals it up and prevents it from hatching. The Bureau has also been able to find or develop new varieties of cotton whose yield is prolific and which mature much earlier than the common varieties. The Bureau has also introduced better cultural methods, so that, taking all of its improvements together, it has been able to demonstrate that in nearly every season a fairly good cotton crop can be grown in spite of the boll weevil. But the Bureau of Plant Industry has done more than this. In the areas of the very worst infection, where the growing of cotton, even with the most effective seed and the best cultural methods, is extremely doubtful, it has taught the people how to make a living without raising cotton. This has been done through what is called the "demonstration and cooperative farm method." By this method a certain number of farmers in a given county would agree with the agents of the Bureau to set apart a certain portion of their farm upon which they would agree to grow the crops which the Bureau agents might direct in exactly the method the agents would prescribe. These were called "demonstration farms."

In the county a large number of other farmers would agree to follow the directions of the Bureau agents as closely as their circumstances would permit. The demonstration farms were regularly visited by local agents of the Bureau to see that the directions were being followed, while those conducting the cooperative farms would be furnished with bulletins and such

instruction as could be given by mail. This method was followed in practically all the Southern States, with the result that not less than 250,000 farmers were brought into actual contact with the agents of the Department of Agriculture, and received more or less direct instruction from them. The result in many places has been almost phenomenal. Regions where a great proportion of farms had been actually abandoned and where the people seemed hopelessly discouraged are now flourishing and in better condition than they ever were before. So successful, indeed, has the work been that it attracted the attention of the general education board at New York, which placed \$70,000 during the current year at the disposal of the Bureau, to be expended in extending the work. It has met with the enthusiastic support of the people in the communities where it has been carried forward, and a great many of which have raised very considerable sums of money by private subscription to extend the work. It is doubtless along this line that the work of the future will be chiefly conducted.

I may say in passing that the success with which this demonstration and cooperative work has met in combating the boll weevil has suggested to members of your committee the idea that it might be profitably extended to other sections of the country. I think every man who has given thoughtful attention to the work of the Department of Agriculture will admit at once that if it has made a mistake in any direction it has been in its failure to get out to the people in usable form the vast store of information which has been accumulated by the experiments and research of the scientists of the Department. For many years a great corps of very able men, trained specialists, have been studying the problems of agriculture here in this Department. Undoubtedly they have made many discoveries which if put into practical effect by the farmers of the country would be of almost incalculable value. Of course many of these discoveries have been put into practical effect, and yet, undoubtedly, very many more of them have not been.

Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent in the aggregate in publishing farm bulletins, the purpose of which was to carry the results of the research of the Department to the people, but the actual effect of which in many cases has been simply to embalm and bury these results. The work in the South during the period of warfare against the boll weevil has demonstrated that the knowledge of the scientists can be carried in a most effective way to very large numbers of individual farmers at a minimum of expense. Comparatively few men are able to practically apply the information which may come to them in a bulletin, but no man is so dull as not to understand the results that are obtained on his own land from the work of his own hand. Your committee is very much disposed, therefore, to encourage the Department in this line of its effort to carry to the people the information that is acquired in its laboratories and on its experimental grounds. No new legislation is required to enable this to be done and no appropriation in this bill is made with special reference to it. The general authority given to the Secretary of Agriculture by the fundamental law of the Department is broad enough to cover this work and the ordinary appropriations are sufficient to carry it forward as rapidly as your committee believes it can be well and economically done. I have mentioned it only because as one of the later and newer methods of the Department in carrying forward its general work it seems to me to be of peculiar interest.

Several new limitations have been inserted in the paragraphs making appropriation for the Bureau of Forestry, all of them fully warranted, your committee believes, by the need of the service and calculated to promote its efficiency. One of the most important of these is a provision directing the Secretary to divide and designate national forests in such manner as he may deem best for administrative purposes. In the absence of such a provision the Secretary is obliged to administer these forests in the shape in which they were originally created, by proclamation of the President. It often happens, of course, that the same forest will occupy sections of two different States, or one part of a forest may be remote from another part, separated by a range of mountains difficult at all times and sometimes impossible to cross. It seemed to your committee to be obviously in the interest of economy and efficiency that the Secretary should be allowed to divide the forests for the purpose named.

Another limitation directs that hereafter permits for power plants within national forests may be made irrevocable, except for breach of condition, for a term not exceeding fifty years. At present any permit of this character is revocable at the will of the Secretary of Agriculture. Your committee believes there is a good deal of justice in the complaint that large investments of capital will not be made and can not safely be



made upon so uncertain a tenure as the will of an administrative officer. Therefore the change suggested has been recommended. There are several other changes recommended in this paragraph, but they are of minor importance and can be sufficiently discussed when we come to consider the bill under the five-minute rule.

I do not wish to dismiss the Bureau of Forestry, however, without at least a few words of comment upon the splendid work this Bureau is doing and upon the broad, beneficent, and statesmanlike policy that it is so effectively carrying forward.

That our timber supply was rapidly disappearing and that something must be done if what remained of the forested area of our public domain was not soon to pass for a song into private hands, was first recognized by Congress in 1891, when an act was passed authorizing the President to set apart forest reserves, or "national forests," as they are now called. The first forests were created by President Harrison, and his example has been followed by his successors, until now the total area within our national forests has reached the imposing aggregate of 164,000,000 acres, an area equal to all of the States of the Union east of the Ohio River and north of North Carolina, equal in extent to the whole German Empire, with Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Denmark thrown in; a princely domain, indeed. And yet there is no thoughtful and informed American citizen who does not regret that the policy could not have been inaugurated a hundred years before it was and the protecting arm of the Federal Government thrown about the once splendid hard-wood forests of our Eastern mountains as it has been about what remains of the stately spruce and pine that clothe the slopes of the Rockies.

Very naturally, but very unfortunately, in the beginning, and for fourteen years afterwards, these forests were put under the charge of the General Land Office. I say very unfortunately, because that office was organized to sell the public domain and not to use it. The mistake was corrected in 1905, when an act was passed transferring these forests to the Department of Agriculture. The wisdom of that transfer was made immediately apparent by the figures on our national balance sheet. During 1905, the last year the forests were administered by the Land Office, the total receipts from the sale of timber, grazing privileges, etc., amounted to \$73,276.15. In the very next year, the first year they were administered by the Department of Agriculture, the receipts from the same purposes jumped to the sum of \$767,219.96. That was in 1906. During the fiscal year of 1907, the total receipts from the forests were \$1,571,059.44; and it is estimated that the receipts this year will not fall below \$2,000,000.

Mr. BONYNGE. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question at this point?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BONYNGE. Is it to be the policy of the Forestry Bureau to make the national forests revenue-producing?

Mr. SCOTT. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BONYNGE. And it is the policy of the Bureau that the forests are maintained for the purpose of making revenue by the National Government out of the development of the resources of the forests?

Mr. SCOTT. They are not maintained for the purpose of making revenue, but the revenue comes incidentally, and ought not, it seems to the committee, to be refused and turned aside.

Mr. BONYNGE. Will the gentleman state to what extent the Government has now gone into the lumber business and how much timber was sold during the past year by the National Government?

Mr. SCOTT. I just stated that the total receipts during the fiscal year, 1907, were \$1,571,059.44.

Mr. BONYNGE. How much was derived from the sale of timber?

Mr. SCOTT. I take from the "Hearings," page 289, the following:

*Summary of receipts from the national forests in the United States for the fiscal year July 1, 1906, to June 30, 1907.*

Timber sales	\$602,565.42
Timber settlements	17,811.25
Timber trespass	66,436.45
Grazing	863,920.32
Special uses	20,326.00
Total	1,571,059.44

Mr. DRISCOLL. This bill carries an appropriation for the forest service nearly \$1,400,000 larger than the last year's appropriation, does it not?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Is that \$1,400,000 received from the forest reserve in one way or another a part of this, or is that expended in addition to this large appropriation?

Mr. SCOTT. When the forests were transferred from the General Land Office in 1905 to the Department of Agriculture that act contained a proviso that all the revenue received from the forests should go into a revolving fund, to be expended by the Forestry Bureau without direct appropriation by Congress. The last session of the last Congress, however, changed that law, and provided that the money received from the use of the forests should be covered as a miscellaneous receipt into the Treasury, to be appropriated out in the way that any other money in the Treasury is appropriated.

But before that law took effect there had accumulated in this revolving fund provided for under the former act \$1,020,000 that was available for the use of the Bureau during the current fiscal year. No money will be available from such source during the coming fiscal year, consequently we are obliged in this bill to appropriate a sufficient amount to make up for the difference.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And that accounts for the large appropriation?

Mr. SCOTT. That accounts for the large appropriation. I may say that during the current year the appropriation for salaries and expenses was \$1,900,000; but in addition to that the Bureau had the use of \$1,020,000 left over from the revolving fund, making the total available for this year \$2,920,000. There is allowed in this bill for that same purpose \$3,296,200, an apparent increase of \$376,200; but as a matter of fact, if the old system had continued and we could use this year all the revenues of the forests, the appropriation carried in the present bill for this Bureau, instead of showing an increase over last year, would show an actual decrease of \$604,300.

It is true, as the gentleman from Colorado has suggested, that there has been a great deal of opposition to the forest policy, and it is very natural that there should be such opposition. Men quickly and naturally and easily come to consider a privilege, in the exercise of which they have not been disturbed, as a vested right. And so the men who had been grazing their flocks and herds upon the thousand hills of the public domain, without money and without price, complained bitterly at first when they were asked to pay a fee for the privilege. The men who had been going into the public forests, not only with ax and saw, but with ax and sawmill, and taking what they wanted for the cost of the taking, felt as if their constitutional rights were being invaded when they were told that the trees they cut would be scaled and a price would be charged for the lumber they yielded. It is natural, I say, that in the beginning there should have been opposition to this policy.

But fortunately that opposition has for the most part disappeared. In the first place the proposition which met the opponents, namely, that the property of all of the people ought not to be monopolized by a few of the people, sounded rather too much like an axiom to be seriously disputed. In the second place it was quickly demonstrated that even the interests of those who had been using the forests free of charge were enhanced by the regulations which followed the imposition of the charge. The wars between the cattle men and the sheep men, which for years had taken their annual toll of human life, became a thing of the past, and peace came to the ranges. The ranges themselves, relieved of overgrazing, rapidly regained their old luxuriance, so that the stock fed upon them comes through the season now in so much better condition than formerly that the difference practically offsets the moderate fee that is charged. If I cared to take the time of the committee, therefore, I could quote whole pages of resolutions and other evidences of public sentiment, to show that those who most bitterly opposed the policy in the beginning are now among its firmest friends.

The Bureau of Chemistry, which comes next in order in this bill, was brought into a position of the very first importance by the passage of the food and drug act. It is probably safe to say that no legislation of recent years has been so far-reaching, so radical in its character, and, I may add, so salutary in its effect as the statute commonly known as the "pure-food law." It was international in its scope, for it barred from our markets all food and drugs, no matter from what country they came, which did not meet the requirements the law laid down. It was revolutionary in its character, because it entered a field which has heretofore not been touched by Federal legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to conclude my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. This legislation, as I was saying, is not only international in its scope, but it is revolutionary in its char-

acter. For the first time in our history the Government of the United States has laid its hands on the manufacturers of foods and drugs and has said to them, "You shall not adulterate or misbrand of short weight your goods." It has been in effect a reenactment by the Congress of the United States of the primal commandment, "Thou shalt not steal, or lie, or cheat." The enforcement of such an act necessarily imposed upon the Bureau responsible for it an enormous amount of work and a heavy responsibility. First of all, the men were to be found—specialists in foods, specialists in drugs, trained chemists, trained microscopists, trained business men; then laboratories were to be established and equipped at all the ports of entry and in all the great commercial centers. All this was preliminary, the mere getting ready. And then followed the ceaseless vigilance which stood guard at every seaport to see that the foreigner did not evade the law and which inspected every domestic market to make sure that our own people obeyed it. And all the time the law was to be interpreted—day by day a score or a hundred cases coming up to demand a ruling—to determine whether they fell within the law or outside of it.

It was a colossal task that was suddenly imposed upon this Bureau, and that it has been so well performed stands vastly to the credit of the great Secretary, whose strength seems equal to any draft made upon it, and to the able and tireless Chief of the Bureau, Dr. H. W. Wiley. It has not been enforced without some friction—that goes with the saying. Hundreds of cases of adulterated goods have been seized, hundreds of foreign invoices have been ordered reshipped, and innumerable bitter protests have been made against the rulings of the Department, particularly touching the use of preservatives and the correctness of labels. But in view of the vast sweep of the new law and its radical and revolutionary character it is a remarkable and, to my mind, a most gratifying fact that thus far it has been found necessary to institute criminal prosecutions in but seventeen cases. There is but one inference to be drawn from this fact, and that is that the great body of men engaged in the preparation and manufacture of foods and drugs are honest men who sincerely desire to obey the law. Indeed, it is only through the cordial support and cooperation of these honest men that anything like an effectual enforcement of a law of this character is at all possible.

I said there had been many protests against the rulings of the Department touching certain matters. Most of these have been amicably adjusted. In some cases, however, the interests involved are so great and the differences of opinion so fundamental that an appeal has been taken to the courts. In order to avoid this necessity so far as possible in the future, the Secretary has recently appointed a special board of referees consisting of Dr. Ira Remsen, president of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., chairman; Prof. Russell H. Chittenden, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; Dr. C. A. Herter, College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York; Dr. Alonzo E. Taylor, University of California, Berkeley, Cal., and Prof. John H. Long, Northwestern University, Chicago, Ill.; a very distinguished board, indeed, to which will be referred in the future questions calling for purely technical and scientific determination upon which the rulings of the Department have been expected to by the parties in interest.

On the whole, therefore, I am glad to be able to report that the enforcement of this law is proceeding smoothly and effectively, and as the meaning of the law becomes settled, as the manufacturers and the Department come together on definitions, the situation will steadily improve until, like the great body of our laws, it will be enforced and obeyed as a matter of course.

It will be, perhaps, a matter of disappointment to some Members of the House to know that there is no apparent increase in the Bureau of Soils.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Before the gentleman leaves the Bureau of Chemistry, will he allow me a question?

Mr. SCOTT. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I notice the report says that there is an increase of \$75,000 allowed for the general expenses of the Bureau. Can the gentleman tell us what the nature of the expense or the increase is, and is it in the employment of additional officials?

Mr. SCOTT. Most of that increase was allowed in order to more effectively enforce the pure-food law. There are now vast sections of the country in which there are practically no agents of the Department, and the Secretary desires very much to cover those sections of the country, so as to get a more effective enforcement of the law.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Did the committee grant as much as the Secretary asked?

Mr. SCOTT. No; the Secretary asked for an increase of \$100,000, and the committee allowed an increase of \$75,000, about \$50,000 of which it is expected by the committee will be used in extending the pure-food inspection and \$25,000 in carrying forward other work of the Bureau.

Mr. LAWRENCE. In view of the importance of the work, I think the increase is very reasonable.

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to hear the gentleman express that opinion.

I was saying that there might be disappointment on the part of many Members of the House when it was noted that there has been no apparent increase in the appropriation for the Bureau of Soils. I hope, however, that when the Members understand the real situation in regard to that Bureau and its relation to the other bureaus of the Department, they will approve of the action of your committee.

It is no doubt true, as the Chief of this Bureau has said in his annual report, that there is a widespread demand for soil surveys. But it is the belief of your committee that this demand comes for the most part from those who misapprehend the real meaning of a soil survey and who would be disappointed if their requests were granted. In briefest possible terms, a soil survey is such a study of a given area as will determine the type or types of soils comprised within it. As a result of this study, a map is made showing the extent and location of the various soils, and a report is printed describing the peculiar characteristics of the different soil types, and suggesting the crops especially adapted to each one. I have always been of the opinion, if I may be pardoned a personal reference, that the average farmer could not make head nor tail of one of these soil survey maps, or get any practical, usable information out of the report that accompanied it. But I have never been able to get anybody to agree with me in that opinion—until this year.

This year the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], appearing before the Committee on Agriculture to present a petition numerously signed by Members of the House for a large increase in the appropriation for this Bureau, gave it as his opinion that a soil survey was absolutely without value unless it could be followed up by experts to tell the people what it meant. There were several representatives of the Bureau present when that statement was made, and neither then nor subsequently did they dissent from it. On the contrary, when specifically asked if they concurred in the opinion expressed by Mr. UNDERWOOD, they replied substantially in the affirmative. Indeed, they went further, and gave it as their opinion that even the trained, skilled, scientific agronomists in the other bureaus of the Department could not properly interpret one of these soil-survey maps; that it could only be done by a soil specialist. I do not cite this change of view on the part of the men engaged in this Bureau in any critical or unkind spirit. They were doubtless sincere in believing in former years that the people could understand their work, and they are no doubt sincere now in believing they can not.

Only it seems rather too bad that for nine years we have been making expensive surveys and publishing expensive maps, only to discover now that they can not be understood by the people they are intended to benefit.

But now that we have made this discovery, what are we going to do about it? The Chief of the Bureau of Soils has himself answered that question by organizing a division of soil management, the work of which is described in the following language:

This work has for its object the investigation of cultural methods required to put the soil into good condition for crops, the crop rotation suited to different soils to maintain them in their highest degree of fertility, and the fertilizer requirements of soils by greenhouse and field methods as an aid in maintaining the fertility of the soil; the effect of different fertilizer constituents and their varying proportions in combinations upon different soils and different crops. This work involves a study of the field, of the best systems of soil management, and of crop adaptation in some of the important agricultural districts of the country, with a view to obtaining from the experience of farmers themselves a better understanding of the best methods of soil management. The object is to disseminate the information so gathered among the people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the gentleman state from what he read?

Mr. SCOTT. I was reading from one of the project sheets of the Bureau of Soils.

Now, that is an eminently sensible proposal, and it is too bad the Bureau of Soils could not have realized many years ago the importance and value of it. But the trouble with it now is that it exactly duplicates work that is already being done, very successfully done, by another bureau of the Department. Several years ago the Bureau of Plant Industry organized what is known as the Division of Farm Management, and that divi-



sion has been most energetically and effectively "studying in the field the best systems of soil management and of crop adaptation, with a view to obtaining from the experience of farmers themselves a better understanding of the best method of soil management." Exactly the work, you see, which the Bureau of Soils now proposes to do.

Your committee does not believe, and I think the House will not believe, that there should be built up in two bureaus of the same Department two great, expensive divisions to cover almost identically the same ground. We believe the work ought to be done, but we believe it ought to be done in the bureau where it is already successfully under way, and which seems to be peculiarly qualified to do it. Your committee, therefore, has declined to recommend the largely increased appropriation which was asked for by the Bureau of Soils for this work. The appropriation we have recommended, while apparently the same as for the current year, as a matter of fact is \$38,000 larger, because that amount will be expended this year for work the continuation of which the committee has declined to authorize, and we believe that the funds carried in this bill will be ample to enable the Bureau to carry forward all the work in its legitimate field which can be profitably done.

Mr. PERKINS. As I understood the gentleman's statement, it is his opinion that on the whole the work done in these soil surveys has not been wholly satisfactory or very valuable.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; that is my opinion.

Mr. PERKINS. I intended to ask whether that was the gentleman's opinion a little further back. Now, I understand it is, because I had occasion a year or two ago to submit to a very intelligent body of men having to do with crops and agriculture in a large way a proposition in which I stated I could obtain a soil survey in certain portions of my State, which I supposed they would welcome gladly. I was surprised, however, to have them write me that they did not regard it as of special value, and did not care to have the soil surveyed in the counties I had indicated. They seemed to have reached the same conclusion which the gentleman in charge of the bill has, that the soil surveys are not of very much practical value.

Mr. SCOTT. I think they are of almost no practical value, as I have said, unless followed by experts who can tell what they mean. I do believe, however, that some of the work of the soil survey has been made valuable after being followed up in the way I have stated.

Mr. DWIGHT. Does this appropriation bill carry money enough to follow up the line of work?

Mr. SCOTT. It does.

Mr. DWIGHT. It is \$170,000—

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to say at this point that the action of the committee in respect to this Bureau met with the entire approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, and there is an understanding with him that the demonstration work which the Bureau of Soils has started shall be carried forward through the division in which it properly belongs, so the work will not stop.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I just want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill what is left then for that Bureau of Soils to do? If you will permit me, I want to testify to the extreme value of the work that has been done along that line by the Bureau of Plant Industry. I do not think it can be overstated, because my business and my home are in the neighborhood where that is appreciated highly. I would like to know, as a matter of administration, what is left for the Bureau of Soils distinctively to do?

Mr. SCOTT. The Bureau of Soils is left to do all the work which in the past it has legitimately done. It came before the committee this year asking for the insertion of new language in this bill to allow it to go ahead and do the demonstration work to which I have referred, but the committee thought that the work ought to be done by the Bureau where it is already organized and under way, and therefore refused to admit new language. But it did not change the old language, so that all the work which the Bureau has been able to do legitimately in the past years it can still continue to do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have never been able to find out what that was.

Mr. SCOTT. I could explain to the gentleman, but it would take a long time and I am sure he will not ask me to do it at this stage of the discussion.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I think it would be interesting if the gentleman will state more fully just what he means by carrying out this work of the Bureau of Soils beyond the survey and map and the report that goes with the map.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, as briefly as I can I will use as an illustration a survey that was made in Florida, where an area was found, which, according to the judgment of the Bureau of Soils, was admirably adapted to growing tobacco. It had been

used heretofore for other crops, and in order to demonstrate that it was suitable for tobacco they have planted tobacco upon it.

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Government or the men?

Mr. SCOTT. The Bureau of Soils had tobacco planted there under the direction of its own employees. It is now going forward to grow tobacco in order to demonstrate that the soil is adapted to the purpose for which its survey declared it to be.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Of course it is not possible for the Bureau of Soils to have enough money to do that with all surveys or maps, because that would require experiment stations all through the country to do that class of work.

Mr. SCOTT. I may say to the members of the committee, who do me the honor to remain here and seem to be interested in this discussion, that it is the judgment of the committee, which I think is shared now by the Secretary, that the Bureau of Soils should devote itself hereafter to what might be called a "regional" survey of the country. Up to this time these surveys have been made here and there and everywhere, yielding practically to the greatest pressure upon the Chief of the Bureau. They have been made in accordance with no fixed plan or after any settled system.

I believe it would be a good idea if they should take, for instance, the Appalachian Mountains system and survey it from north to south, making a systematic survey, determining, if they are able to do it, what fruits or crops are best adapted to the various soils located in that region. I believe it would be a good idea for them to take the semiarid strip of country from Canada down this side of the mountains as far as Texas, and make a regional survey of that section. That is the class of work which we hope to see the Bureau doing in the future.

In the Bureau of Entomology the only important change suggested has been the elimination of the language under which, in former years, work had been done in the hope of developing the silk industry. We have been trying for a long time to grow silk in this country. As far back as 1622 King James the First offered premiums for the breeding of silk worms in Virginia. A little over a century later a parcel of Government ground in Georgia was allotted for growing mulberry trees in aid of silk culture. In 1748 Parliament put a premium on silk culture in the colonies, and in 1766 the South Carolina assembly voted a thousand pounds for the establishment of a silk filature in Charleston. Benjamin Franklin, while acting as the agent of Pennsylvania in England, sent home silkworm eggs and mulberry cuttings to start silk growing. At different times in different places and in many different ways during the next hundred years the effort was made to introduce the industry into this country. Along in the early eighties Congress started in vigorously upon the subject, making an appropriation of \$15,000 to promote silk culture. This was raised a year or two later to \$30,000. Later it was dropped to \$10,000, and for the past few years a sum ranging between that and \$5,000 has been annually expended by the Department for that purpose. But out of all these efforts and experiments nothing practical has come. The Department estimates that throughout the entire country during the past year less than \$1,000 worth of cocoons were produced. It does not seem to your committee worth while to continue to spend from \$5,000 to \$10,000 a year to promote an industry which, after nearly three hundred years of effort, has not been able to reach an annual product in excess of \$1,000. The committee recommends, therefore, that the authority for further expenditure be withdrawn. When the time comes in the United States, and Heaven send it may never come, when a large proportion of our population are forced to work for a daily wage of 25 cents, the silk industry can doubtless be established, but not before then.

Mr. BURGESS. Will the gentleman permit me a minute? I am very much interested in what he has said about this soil-survey matter. Before he gets away from that I would like to see if I understand correctly what the situation is now. There is no change in this bill in that Bureau?

Mr. SCOTT. Absolutely the language of the bill remains—

Mr. BURGESS. Does it carry an appropriation for the continuance of their work as heretofore done?

Mr. SCOTT. They will have, as I stated a few moments ago, as a matter of fact, \$38,000 more for their legitimate work than they have this year, for the reason that they are spending \$38,000 this year for this demonstration work which next year will be done in another bureau.

Mr. BURGESS. And the provision is to carry out the dissemination of this matter that they gather, in these maps, and so forth?

Mr. DRISCOLL. As a matter of fact, most of the experimental work now is in reference to tobacco. I mean where they practically try out these soils.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; they are doing more work in tobacco than in anything else.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Is there anything in this appropriation to continue the experimental work?

Mr. SCOTT. The work in tobacco, with the exception of perhaps one or two small areas, has already been turned over to the Bureau of Plant Industry, and it will be carried forward as in former years.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I understand the chairman to say that the work they have to do with the \$38,000 next year would be confined to legitimate business of the Bureau. Unfortunately for me, I was not present when the gentleman explained this particular feature of the bill. Do I understand by that that there will be no further appropriation for the utilization work of this Bureau?

Mr. SCOTT. I have already stated—and I will be glad if the gentleman would do me the honor to look up my remarks in the Record to-morrow, where he will see it explained fully—I have already stated that the demonstration work, the utilization work, which the Bureau of Soils has started in various sections of the country will be carried forward by the Bureau of Plant Industry.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Now, will the chairman tell us under what section of this bill the Bureau of Plant Industry has any authority to do this work?

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, it has already been doing the work for many years, and its authority is not questioned. You will find the language fully authorizes this Bureau to carry information to the people by means of demonstration work, as well as in other ways.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I do not want to be understood as questioning the authority. I was simply asking for the information. I am very anxious that the work go forward, and it is immaterial to me which bureau carries it forward.

Mr. SCOTT. I share the gentleman's interest in having this work go forward, and I wish to assure him the committee had it clearly understood that this should be done before making any change in this bill.

It will be remembered that the last agricultural appropriation bill contained a paragraph directing the Secretary to report to this Congress whether or not the Bureau of Biology was doing work which is duplicated by the Government and which is of real economic value. That report has been made and is available for all who wish to consult it. In the opinion of your committee it demonstrates clearly that the work of the Bureau is not a duplication of any being done elsewhere and that it is of direct and very great value to agriculture. For one thing, this Bureau is charged with the enforcement of the law prohibiting the introduction into the United States of diseased or injurious birds and mammals—a very important function. It is also responsible for enforcing the Lacey Act for the protection of game.

But in addition to these administrative functions, the work which the Bureau has done in acquiring and publishing information as to the birds and mammals which are beneficial and those which are injurious, the influence it has exerted in protecting the beneficial varieties, and the methods it has devised for exterminating those which are injurious, is undoubtedly of very great practical value. Your committee has therefore not only given the Bureau a place in the bill, but has recommended a moderate increase in its appropriation.

The work of the Division of Accounts and Disbursements, of the Division of Publications, of the Bureau of Statistics, and the library necessarily is of the same character from year to year, and calls for no special comment, except to remark that the moderate increases recommended in their respective appropriations are only such as in the judgment of your committee were warranted by the general growth of the Department.

Under the head of contingent expenses we have included an item of \$25,000 for the purpose of installing a power plant at the new Agricultural Department building. This estimate comes to us in the way prescribed by law, by the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, and upon the assurance of the Secretary of the Treasury that the power which it is sought to create can not be obtained as cheaply from any other source; and I hope the item will be permitted to remain in the bill.

Under the Office of Experiment Stations your committee has directed that not to exceed \$5,000 be expended to establish and maintain an experiment station on the Island of Guam. This tiny and remote island came into our hands, as everybody knows, by virtue of the treaty with Spain. It is said to be extremely fertile, and the native population, about 9,000 souls, is reputed to be peace loving, intelligent, and industrious. Certain it is that the people have never given us any trouble, and perhaps for that reason we have neglected them.

One of the Commissioners from the Philippines, who was quartered there for two years as a prisoner of war, tells me that the only agricultural implements they have are the rude hoes which they have fashioned from the gun barrels left there by the Spaniards. They have not exactly beaten their spears into pruning hooks and their swords into plowshares, but they have come as near to it as their raw material would admit. Before the American occupation the chief food supply of the island came from the coconut trees; but by our carelessness some diseased trees were introduced, and the disease is spreading to the native groves with a rapidity that threatens their total destruction. It is certainly "up to us" to try to do something to at least offset the calamity we have brought upon the people of this lonely and far-away island, and the \$5,000 carried in this bill for their benefit will at least make a beginning.

A year ago it was decided to discontinue the nutrition work that was being done in Connecticut at the expense of the Department, and an appropriation of \$5,000 was made to defray the expense of closing up the laboratory there and bringing the machinery it contained to Washington. Only \$2,000 of that amount was expended for this purpose, and the present bill recommends that the remaining \$3,000 be expended in setting up the apparatus and preparing for publication the results already obtained.

Mr. GRAFF. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. GRAFF. I have taken some interest in looking up the progress of the investigation of the Department of Agriculture as to new material for the manufacture of paper. Will the gentleman be kind enough to state how far that investigation has progressed and whether there has been any material result or promise of result?

Mr. SCOTT. I will state to my friend from Illinois that this bill, for the first time, carries authority to make the investigations to which he refers. They have not been undertaken—at least not in any systematic way—up to this time.

Mr. GRAFF. I understood they had made some investigation, but not to any large extent.

Mr. SCOTT. Nothing upon which any report has been made. It is a matter of common knowledge that our supply of spruce and fir trees, from which practically all the print paper now in use in this country is made, is rapidly becoming exhausted. It is hard to imagine any single agricultural discovery which would begin to equal in importance to the whole country the discovery of a plant from which paper could be cheaply and easily made. Your committee felt fully warranted, therefore, in placing \$10,000 at the disposal of the Secretary in order that the search might begin.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi with pleasure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Toward what material do the investigations seem to point?

Mr. SCOTT. As I said to the gentleman from Illinois, the investigations have not proceeded far enough for them to have made a report. They expect to study various fibers—flax fiber, cornstalk fiber, and perhaps some grasses from the Philippines—but the work has not yet really begun.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I asked the gentleman the question because, having the utmost confidence in the soundness of his judgment, I wanted to know if he thought it would be easier to get cheap paper that way, to wit, by expending the money of the Government in experiments in some new paper material rather than simply to put wood pulp and print paper on the free list now.

Mr. SCOTT. I am sure my distinguished friend the Senator from Mississippi [laughter]—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not Senator yet.

Mr. SCOTT. Does not expect me to enter into a tariff debate at this time. I might say, in just a few words, that if he could convince me that the tariff on wood pulp and paper, which has remained the same for the past ten years, is wholly responsible for the great advance in the price of paper that has taken place during that time, I perhaps would be willing—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Supposing I could convince you that it is partially responsible, would not that have the same effect?

Mr. SCOTT. If the gentleman could convince me to that effect I would be greatly interested in discussing that question when it is properly before the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Until that, then, your idea is to make the consumers of paper, virtually all the people, pay the American cost of paper, the duty added, and then spend more money of the Government, contributed by the people, in trying to find out something else out of which paper can be made?

Mr. SCOTT. Until then and after then I am of the opinion



that if we could by the expenditure of \$10,000 a year for a few years find some material besides the trees which grow in our forests out of which paper could be made the expenditure would be amply justified.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will state that I had another reason for asking the gentleman these questions. I am very much interested in some recent literature upon the subject of making paper out of cotton stalks. I think you can not make paper out of cotton stalks as well or as cheaply as out of the things you now make it of, and still I thought perhaps it was an insidious effort of the Republican party to bribe the cotton raisers by the hope of an opportunity of developing a new industry. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman is no doubt fully warranted in that suspicion. [Laughter.]

I desire now, Mr. Chairman, to call the attention of the committee to the two emergency appropriations carried in this bill.

Two years ago, in response to a most urgent appeal, the Congress authorized an appropriation of \$82,500 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into cooperation with the different States for the purpose of preventing the further spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths, which were ravaging the groves and forests of the New England States. The work was undertaken and the results were so encouraging that Congress last year increased the appropriation to \$150,000. This year, upon the earnest appeal of the representatives on this floor from the States concerned, your committee has recommended that the appropriation be increased to \$250,000. This is a very large sum of money; but the emergency is very great. Those best qualified to know assure us that practically the whole forest area of all the New England States is threatened, and the loss, if the ravages of these pests can not be prevented, will be incalculable.

The local appreciation of the gravity of the danger is shown by the fact that the State of Massachusetts alone expended more than a million dollars by legislative appropriation before coming to the General Government for aid, while other States have also expended generous sums. Your committee felt, therefore, that any reasonable appropriation would be but a bagatelle if it should result in preventing the further spread of these devastating pests. The work has been done under direction of the Bureau of Entomology, and has followed two general lines, one the introduction of parasites and one the actual physical destruction of the insects. In certain parts of Europe where the gypsy moth has always existed it has been kept in check by certain parasites. During the past two years forty varieties of these parasites have been brought over here, and the entomologists are certain that some of them at least have become acclimated and will give a good account of themselves. It is through the activity of these natural enemies that the ultimate control of the moth must be obtained.

In the meantime it is highly important that they should be prevented as far as possible from spreading, and it is in that work that the greater part of the money heretofore appropriated has been expended. The results, as reported to your committee, have been very encouraging indeed. Those engaged in the work, however, and those who have observed it are of the opinion that a large sum spent within the next year or two will bring vastly better results than the same sum extended over a longer period, and the amount carried in the bill is therefore recommended.

The second emergency appropriation carried in the bill is that for the eradication of what is commonly known as the Texas cattle tick, the parasite which transmits the Texas fever. This item first appeared in the bill two years ago, the same time as that for the extermination of the gypsy moth, and for the same amount, \$82,500. The amount was increased last year, as the gypsy moth appropriation was, to \$150,000, and in this bill both of them are again brought to the same amount.

But while the two appropriations from the beginning have been twins, the problems they represent are very different. The gypsy moth is a foreigner, but recently introduced and spreading with alarming rapidity. The cattle tick is a native and has been long a subject of quarantine. One represents what might be called an acute attack, while the other is a chronic case. The Texas tick is responsible for the quarantine line which for nearly twenty years has stretched across our country from one ocean to the other. The annual cost of maintaining this line to the different States and to the nation can hardly be less than half a million dollars. But that is the smallest item of the loss inflicted upon the country by the cattle tick. The presence of the tick depreciates the price of every head of cattle below the quarantine line, while it deprives the Northern States of the market they would otherwise find in the South for their high-grade stock. The loss to the North can not be

even guessed at, but careful men have assured us that the annual loss suffered by the States south of the line can not be less than \$40,000,000.

If this estimate is even approximately correct, it needs no argument to justify a most liberal appropriation from the Federal Treasury to combat the pest that inflicts such stupendous loss, provided it can be done with any hope of success. Two years ago the committee hesitated to authorize the attempt, because at first blush it seemed a hopeless task to attack an insect infesting a vast region where the climatic and other conditions were perfectly suited to its enormously rapid reproduction. The experience of the past two years, however, has been highly encouraging. During that time different areas, aggregating 60,000 square miles, have been freed from the ticks and the quarantine line moved that much farther southward. It will take a long while, of course—perhaps fifteen or twenty years—to complete the work. But there seems no doubt that if persisted in it can be done, and even if it takes twice the estimated time it will be well worth doing. Let the quarantine line be forced down to the Mexican border, where it belongs, so that cattle can be freely shipped northward or southward from every State in the Union, and the advantage to the whole country will be simply incalculable.

I believe I have now touched upon all the features of this bill that seem to call for extended comment. When we come to consider the bill under the five-minute rule, I or other members of the committee will be glad, of course, to discuss any of its details concerning which explanation may be desired.

It would afford me a great deal of pleasure, Mr. Chairman, in presenting this bill to describe at length the intensely interesting and very valuable work that is being done by each one of the great bureaus of this great Department, but I do not wish to weary the patience of the House. Very briefly let me say, in closing, that of all the great Departments of our Government none has had a beginning so modest and inconspicuous as that of the Department of Agriculture, and, with the possible exception of the Post-Office, not one now comes into such close and intimate and helpful contact with so great a proportion of our people.

The first direct appropriation by act of Congress for the benefit of agriculture in the United States was that of March 3, 1839, directing that the sum of \$1,000 be expended by the Commissioner of Patents "in the collection of agricultural statistics, and for other agricultural purposes." I was a little curious to know just how the Commissioner expended that vast sum of money, so I hunted up his report for the following year, and this is what I found:

The small appropriation made in 1839 for statistics and other agricultural purposes has limited the expenses of the Commissioner to the sum granted. Upward of 30,000 packages of seeds have been distributed during the last year, and from the gratification expressed by those who have received them the most favorable anticipations are indulged that the effort thus made has met the cordial and thankful acknowledgments of the agricultural community. When the seeds collected in the remote parts of the globe, together with those more easily procured, shall arrive and be distributed, still further gratification and benefit may be expected.

From which it will be seen that those of our colleagues who have so valiantly championed the free-seed distribution have been defending an ancient, if not an honorable, precedent.

Whatever the good results may have been from the expenditure of this initial \$1,000, Congress did not see fit to continue it, and it was not until 1842 that another \$1,000 was appropriated. The language of the act remained the same, "For the collection of agricultural statistics and for other agricultural purposes." And this is the language in which all the subsequent appropriations were made up to 1852. By that time the appropriation had climbed to \$5,000, and the language was changed to read: "For the collection of agricultural statistics and for the purchase of seeds." Clearly the point had been reached at which the Congress did not want to take the chances of the Commissioner of Patents placing the wrong interpretation upon that phrase, "other agricultural purposes." The language was not again materially changed until 1856, when \$30,000 was appropriated "For the collection of agricultural statistics, investigations for promoting agriculture and rural economy, and the procurement and distribution of cuttings and seeds."

In 1861 the wording of the act was broadened to provide for the "propagation" as well as the procurement and distribution of seeds, and in 1862 provision was made for the introduction and protection of insectivorous birds and for investigations to test the practicability of preparing flax and hemp as a substitute for cotton—this last to be considered, I presume, as a sort of war measure.

By this time an Agricultural Division had been organized in the Department of the Interior, consisting of 9 persons, under the immediate direction of the Commissioner of Patents,

through whom all the appropriations thus far made for agricultural purposes were to be expended. It was this division which, by act of Congress approved May 15, 1862, was withdrawn from the Interior and organized as a separate bureau, the chief of which was designated as the Commissioner of Agriculture. Slowly still, but steadily, this division grew, receiving every year a larger appropriation and broadening every year the scope of its work until, in 1889, when its appropriation had reached the sum of \$1,134,480, and the number of its employees had grown to 488, it was considered worthy to be dignified as a full-fledged Executive Department of the Government with a Cabinet minister at its head.

That was but nineteen years ago, and yet in that time what a place this Department has made for itself in the economic and industrial life of this nation! I said a moment ago that with the possible exception of the Post-Office no other Department of our Government comes into such intimate contact with so great a proportion of our people. And is that not literally true?

Every morning millions of American citizens, opening their daily papers, glance first of all at the forecast of the day's weather, sent out by the Department of Agriculture, and govern their day's plans very largely by what they see there. Every day during the growing season 2,000,000 American farmers receive by telephone the weather report, which shapes in large degree the conduct of their farming operations. At every seaport and at every harbor of our Great Lakes the employees and observers of this Bureau stand guard, and the warnings that they give to the men who go down to the sea in ships have saved hundreds of lives every year and millions of dollars' worth of property.

And as the Weather Bureau stands guard over the lives and property of the people, so the other bureaus of this great Department keep watch over their health and the health of their domestic animals. For many years the Bureau of Animal Industry has been waging war upon the diseases that ravage the flocks and herds of our Western ranges, and now it has set itself to lift the embargo from the Southern pastures. During the fiscal year 1907 nearly 6,000,000,000 pounds of American food products passed into the markets of the world unchallenged, because they bore the approving stamp of the Department of Agriculture, while 33,000,000 pounds of similar products were destroyed without protest, because that Department declared they were unfit for human food.

Similar but even more far-reaching authority is exercised by the Bureau of Chemistry, for its agents stand in every market place with almost despotic power of approval or condemnation over the foods and drugs that are offered for sale therein. You would seek long through the statute books of the nation before you would find more broad or more searching police powers than are vested in these two bureaus of the Department of Agriculture.

And so if time served I could take up all the bureaus of this great Department, one after the other, and show how they are extending their ceaseless activities in a thousand helpful ways, "promoting the interests of agriculture in the broadest and most comprehensive sense of that term," as the law declares they shall do, and thereby promoting every other interest in all our land. For the Department of Agriculture is the great productive, wealth-creating, and wealth-saving Department of our Government.

Testifying under oath last year before a committee of this House the chiefs of the various bureaus of this Department declared it to be their deliberate judgment that the money value of the Department to the people during that year had not been less than \$231,000,000. That means that for every dollar expended for its maintenance during that year this Department had paid the people back \$16. It means that for every dollar expended upon that Department from the first paltry thousand dollars, away back in 1839 down to the present hour, this Department, in a single year, gave back three and one-half dollars. This is one of the Government Departments that pays. It is one of the Departments an appropriation for which may be regarded as an investment and not as an expense.

Appreciating, therefore, the great importance of the work this Department is doing, your committee has given the bill, which is to provide for its maintenance, the most diligent and painstaking consideration.

Before Congress convened last December, the ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. LAMB] and the present chairman spent nearly four weeks in the Department, carefully studying the different bureaus and making themselves as familiar as possible with all their details. Beginning immediately after the holiday recess, the entire committee held daily hearings extending over a period of five weeks, taking up every item of the bill and questioning at length the Bureau offi-

cials who were responsible for the expenditure it provided. Following the public hearings, the subcommittee devoted a week to the preparation of the bill, when it was again submitted to the full committee for final review. Whatever may be its imperfections, therefore, the measure now before the House represents the very best judgment your committee is capable of exercising.

We believe it grants no dollar which is not needed by the public service, and we do not believe it withholds a dollar which the public service requires. It comes before you with a unanimous report from the committee, every member of the committee supporting every item in it, and it is respectfully submitted for the candid consideration of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Before the gentleman takes his seat I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. SCOTT. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I see that the committee has put a limitation on the power of the Secretary to rent or purchase road machines. Why was that done?

Mr. SCOTT. Because your committee does not believe it to be the function of the General Government to engage in the construction of public roads.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But you propose to give the Secretary the power to make practical investigation of the best methods of constructing roads, and yet you limit his power to do it.

Mr. SCOTT. We give him the power to investigate as to the best method of building roads, but we do not think it is necessary for the Department to go out and build the roads to determine the best methods any more than we believe it would be necessary for the agent of the Bureau of Plant Industry to plow the land and plant the seed himself when he goes into Texas or North Carolina to teach the people how to raise cotton in spite of the boll weevil.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the Secretary of Agriculture ask that this be discontinued, or that the limitation be put upon him?

Mr. SCOTT. I must say that the Secretary was not consulted about that matter. The committee simply exercised its best judgment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In my judgment, the best and most practical way of determining which is the best method of building a road is in the actual construction of the road.

Mr. SCOTT. I shall be glad to discuss the matter with the gentleman at greater length when we come to consider the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, the full and most complete and deeply interesting statement that we have listened to from the chairman of the committee must convince the House, what the Committee on Agriculture have known from the first day of the organization of that committee for the present Congress, that the mantle of the former worthy and indefatigable, earnest, and economical chairman of this committee, Mr. Wadsworth, of New York, has fallen on worthy shoulders in the person of the gentleman from Kansas. [Applause.] He has well stated that this bill has been carefully and conservatively prepared, so much so that I do not believe it possible for the other branch of this Congress to add anything to its provisions. And so carefully has it been considered and prepared in another direction that I do hope it leaves no opportunity for the point of order fief, if I may so describe him, to exercise his energy.

I would not if I could, and I could not if I would, add anything to what has been so well said by the chairman in explaining this bill. One thing must have impressed this House, and that is that I was right from the first in contending that upon this agricultural bill, so important to the House and to the country, the debate should not have been limited to four hours' discussion. Although I agreed to it, I did it because I believed I could borrow two hours from that side when these gentlemen during Lent were better engaged, and under the five-minute rule these impecunious friends on this side would take something from under the five-minute rule. But when the splendid chairman of this committee has found it necessary—owing mostly, I think, to the interrogatories put to him—to take one-half of the time on his side, I do not see how we are to discuss the various measures here in the time that is left. But I do hope that this committee will allow the debate to run sufficient time to let the most of our friends on this side have an opportunity to express themselves.

I did hope to say something on one of the most important bills before this Agricultural Committee—the Appalachian chain and White Mountain bill—but I do not wish to take up the time. I never put anything in the Record that I do not say on the floor, and therefore I shall be debarred that pleasure and duty, from my view point. We know how last year an appropriation of \$25,000 was made to sidetrack that



measure, and how this year it has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. This will rob the people of this country of the benefits that must accrue from the bill, and call the previous question on the next generation of people in the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time, and, with the consent of the chairman on the other side, I will yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia does not control the time.

Mr. LAMB. Then I will reserve the balance of my time, except that I will yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. A member of the minority on the committee has requested recognition, and the Chair will have to recognize him first.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I waive my rights to be recognized now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, before I make the announcement for the purpose for which I rise, I want to ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks an address delivered by Moorfield Storey, of the State of Massachusetts, on "The duty of the United States toward the Philippine Islands," being a reply to a speech lately made by Secretary Taft.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to print in his remarks the document indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The document referred to is as follows:

THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES TOWARD THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS—  
A REPLY TO SECRETARY TAFT BY MOORFIELD STOREY.

"No great civilized power has ever managed with such wisdom and disinterestedness the affairs of a people committed by the accident of war to its hands. \* \* \* Save only our attitude toward Cuba I question whether there is a brighter page in the annals of international dealing between the strong and the weak than the page which tells of our doings in the Philippines."

It is in such modest phrase that the President eulogizes the Philippine policy for which he is so largely responsible, and to support this proposition and to strengthen his own claims upon the confidence of the American people, Secretary Taft has made his speech to the ministers in Boston and written his elaborate report to the President.

The attitude of these gentlemen is natural, but experience does not justify us in relying too implicitly upon the statements of officials as to the purposes and success of their own administration, national or municipal, and we must remember that from the dawn of history the oppressor has always insisted that oppression was good for the oppressed, and that his own action, to quote Secretary Taft's words, has been "altruistic."

History is constantly repeating itself. In the House of Representatives hardly more than fifty years ago human slavery in the United States was described "as a great moral, social, political, and religious blessing—a blessing to the slave and a blessing to the master," while Senator Hammond, of South Carolina, praised it as "a moral and humane institution, productive of the greatest political and social advantages." For years the strong forces of the nation, the ministers, the lawyers, the merchants, the bankers, the politicians, upheld it, and their speeches and writings were filled with evidence of its beneficent effects. These defenders of slavery were doubtless honest, but every American knows now how false their claims were. All admit that slavery was a curse to the master even more than to the slave and wonder how any men could ever have thought otherwise.

The result of all human experience was stated by Lincoln when he said:

"These arguments that are made that the inferior race are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying, that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow—what are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for the enslaving of the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments of kingcraft were always of this class; they always bestrode the necks of the people—not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better for being ridden. \* \* \* Turn it every way you will, whether it came from the mouth of a king as an excuse for enslaving the people of his country, or from the mouth of men of one race as a reason for enslaving the men of another race—it is all the same old serpent."

Thus did the greatest leader of the Republican party characterize more than fifty years ago the argument which is now made by him who aspires to sit in Lincoln's chair. Lincoln was a true prophet when he said in Springfield while describing the Declaration of Independence:

"Its authors meant it to be—as, thank God, it is now proving itself—a stumbling block to all those who in after times might seek to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism. They knew the proneness of prosperity to breed tyrants, and they meant when such should reappear in this fair land and commence their vocation, they should find left for them at least one hard nut to crack."

His words might have been spoken to-day. Secretary Taft finds the Declaration of Independence a stumbling block, just as Lincoln prophesied, and we may judge how far to rely on his statements as to Philippine conditions by examining his argument against the Declaration of Independence.

On January 30 he said at Cleveland:

"Since the foundation of our Government the people of the United States, that is the States as distinguished from the Territories, have been engaged in governing other people. We did it in the case of Louisiana. We have done it in the case of every Territory that was subsequently admitted to the United States, and we are doing it to-day in the case of New Mexico and Arizona. What in principle is the

difference between the assertion by Congress of the right to pass a law which shall be obeyed by men in New Mexico who have no voice in the selection of the Representatives and Senators who vote that law and the passing by Congress of such a law for the Government of the Philippines or Porto Rico? \* \* \* If the latter is a violation of the Declaration of Independence, we have been violating the Declaration of Independence for a hundred years."

We may almost ask if the Secretary knows what the Declaration says. Its words are:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The people of the United States, beginning as a fringe of inhabitants on the edge of a continent, adopted a Constitution to which they consented. This Constitution gave to Congress control over the unoccupied land not belonging to any State, and in the exercise of that power Congress has adopted the policy of letting persons settle on this land and organize Territorial governments, and as these settlers have become sufficiently numerous in any region, of admitting that region as a State. To this policy the people as a whole have consented, and every man who has settled in a Territory has done it with knowledge of this policy and has consented to it. The governed in each Territory have consented to the government just as the man who enlists in the Army consents to obey the orders of his officers.

We acquired Louisiana by purchase, and by the treaty bound ourselves to incorporate its inhabitants in the Union and give them all the rights of American citizens, and we kept this obligation faithfully and promptly.

In the Philippine Islands there are some eight millions of people who have never consented to our Government, and whom we govern to-day simply because we were strong enough to overpower their resistance by force of arms. They are a people united in desiring their independence, and we refuse it because we say they are unfit to govern themselves.

Is it possible that so able a lawyer as Judge Taft has never detected this difference between the cases of Arizona and the Philippines? If he has not, what must we think of his legal acumen?

The distinction which Judge Taft is unable to see was very clear to President McKinley, whom Mr. Taft was eulogizing, for he said, in 1890, "The government by the people \* \* \* must rest upon the free consent of the governed and of all the governed," and in 1898, when the Spanish war broke out, he said in his message to Congress: "I speak not of forcible annexation, for that, under our code of morals, would be criminal aggression," a phrase no one would think of using to describe the government of New Mexico. This speech of Secretary Taft at Cleveland must be remembered whenever we are weighing his statements. To him the Declaration of Independence has proved indeed "a stumbling block."

When we read the Secretary's speech at Boston, and the words of the President as to our dealings with the Filipinos, we wonder if the American people have forgotten the horrors of Samar and Batangas, the terrible destruction of Filipino life, the burning of cities and villages, the practice of reconcentration on a larger scale than was ever thought of by the Spaniards, the "water cure" and other tortures systematically employed, the misery and ruin which our conquest brought on the Filipino people! Have they forgotten how Aguinaldo was invited to aid us, how he was permitted to establish a government, how that government was destroyed? Have they forgotten that the first engagement, fought before the treaty was ratified and before we had any title to a foot of the Philippines, was, in the words of General Otis, "strictly defensive on the part of the insurgents and of vigorous attack by our forces?" Even then the Filipinos were already called "insurgents," though they were still, on Mr. Taft's theory, subjects of Spain. Have they forgotten that we refused even to treat with them after the battle; that, in the words of Mr. McKinley, we would have "no useless parley?" Have they forgotten the massacre of Mount Dajo? If there is a darker chapter in the history of the dealings between a strong and a weak people, it must be many centuries ago. Secretary Taft at Grand Rapids ventured to say that Abraham Lincoln "would have approved the Philippine policy from the beginning to the end." Can any man who has read Lincoln's words believe that he could have approved this record of treachery and bloodshed?

But men say, Why revive these memories that we would fain obliterate? Because to deal with the problem of the Philippine Islands properly we must never forget the history of our occupation, and when we are considering whether we are more fit to govern them than they are to govern themselves, we must remember what our representatives have done, and must ever keep in mind that what has happened during the last eight years may well happen again. The American people like to think themselves more capable than any other nation, but we can not settle this great question wisely unless we face the facts. Misrepresentation and concealment do not help us to a just decision. Secretary Taft from the outset of his career has never laid before the American people the naked truth. Were all the facts known, they would prove the truth of Lincoln's famous words:

"No man is good enough to govern another without that other's consent. I say this is the leading principle, the sheet anchor of American republicanism." "When the white man governs himself that is self-government, but when he governs himself and also governs another man, that is more than self-government, that is despotism."

Our course has proved that we are no exception to the rule laid down by John Stuart Mill:

"The government of a people by itself has a meaning and a reality, but such a thing as a government of one people by another does not and can not exist. \* \* \* If the good of the governed is the proper business of a government, it is utterly impossible that a people should directly attend to it; and unless we recognize this truth, we are destined to learn it by bitter experience."

It is very pleasant to read in Mr. Taft's report that "The national policy is to govern the Philippine Islands for the benefit and welfare and uplifting of the people of the islands, and gradually to extend to them, as they shall show themselves fit to exercise it, a greater and greater measure of popular self-government," and "that when the Filipino people as a whole show themselves reasonably fit to conduct a popular self-government, maintaining law and order and offering equal protection of the laws and civil rights to rich and poor, and desire complete independence of the United States, they shall be given it." It is pleasant to find the President saying more explicitly that their "complete independence" is a goal of which "we desire that it be reached at as early a date as possible for the sake of the Filipinos and for our own sake."

This assertion of altruistic benevolence, this declaration of a policy whose sole object is the advancement of the Filipinos, shows a marked advance since the day when Senator LODGE, as president of the Republican national convention, said in his address to the convention:

"We make no hypocritical pretense of being interested in the Filipinos solely on account of others. While we regard the welfare of these people as a sacred trust, we regard the welfare of the American people first. We see our duty to ourselves as well as to others. We believe in trade expansion."

The contrast shows progress in the right direction. Secretary Taft and the anti-imperialists are in accord as to their object. There remain simply the questions of how to reach that end and how to decide when it is attained.

Mr. Taft's first postulate is that they are now incapable of governing themselves. He uses the argument which Lincoln ascribes to the opponents of political freedom: "They said some men are too ignorant and vicious to share in government." Again history repeats itself.

He said at Boston, that when the war with the Filipinos began, "Aguinaldo had established some sort of government in the provinces, but it was an arbitrary, tyrannical, military government under the guise of something better, but full of a corruption quite equal to that which they could complain of in the Spanish times."

Secretary Taft did not reach Manila till after this government had been broken up, and does not, therefore, speak from personal knowledge. Against his statement let us put the words of our naval and military commanders and of a witness, upon whom, in dealing with such questions, two Administrations have seemed to rely, the Hon. John Barrett, Chief of the Bureau of South American Republics.

Admiral Dewey, on June 27, 1898, cabled:

"In my opinion, these people are far superior in their intelligence and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba, and I am familiar with both races."

General Merritt, on his arrival in Paris in October, 1898, was reported as saying:

"The Filipinos impress me very favorably. I think great injustice was done the native population. \* \* \* They are more capable of self-government than, I think, the Cubans are. They are considered to be good Catholics. They have lawyers, doctors, and men of kindred professions, who stand well in the community and bear favorable comparison with those other countries. They are dignified, courteous, and reserved."

John Barrett saw the government organized by the Filipinos in operation and described it as "a government which has practically been administering the affairs of that great island [Luzon] since the American possession of Manila, and which is certainly better than the former administration. It has a properly formed cabinet and congress, the members of which in appearance and manner would compare favorably with Japanese statesmen. The congressmen, whose sessions I repeatedly attended, conducted themselves with great decorum and showed a knowledge of debate and parliamentary law that would not compare unfavorably with the Japanese parliament. The executive portion of the government was made up of a ministry of bright men, who seemed to understand their respective positions," while among Aguinaldo's advisers were "men of acknowledged ability as international lawyers."

Mr. Taft says in his report, "No one denies that 80 per cent of the Filipino people are densely ignorant. \* \* \* And again, 'It is not too much to say that knowledge of Spanish is a fairly good indication whether an individual can be said to be educated.'"

Against this judgment let me call two witnesses who have been in the islands.

Captain Hatch, of the Eighteenth Infantry, after serving for more than a year in the islands and being brought in contact with thousands of the people, said:

"The Filipinos are Malays softened by contact with the Spaniards. \* \* \* The Filipino is essentially honest. \* \* \* The Filipinos are a deeply religious people. \* \* \* They are a temperate, sober people. During a year's residence among them I never saw a drunken Filipino. They are a cleanly people. They are hospitable, and they are generous in their hospitality. They are not an ignorant people. Their intelligence and educational progress are apt to be underestimated because of failure to understand them. Nearly every adult can read and write in the Tagalo or Viscayan dialect, while the natives of the cities and villages, in addition, can read and write the Spanish language. Moreover, most adults know something of arithmetic, geography, and history. I was surprised one day, in questioning the driver of my gully, an ordinary poor boy of 18, to find that he had studied geometry, and had made very material progress."

"The Filipinos are not so much different from other people. Their customs, habits, hopes, and aspirations are deep seated. Their leaders are shrewd, bright men of much ability; the masses are earnest in their loyalty."

An American Congressman, Mr. Shafroth, who visited the islands, said:

"The general impression exists among many Americans that the Philippine people are savages. A visit to the islands will certainly dispel any such delusion."

"When I find behind the prescription desks of the numerous drug stores of the islands, even when kept by Americans and Englishmen, Filipinos compounding medicines taken from bottles labeled in Latin; when I see behind the counters of banks having large capital natives acting as bookkeepers and as receiving and paying tellers; when I find them as merchants and clerks in almost all lines of business, as telegraph operators and ticket agents, conductors and engineers upon railroads, and as musicians rendering upon almost all instruments high-class music; when I am told that they alone make the observations and intricate calculations at the Manila observatory, and that prior to the insurrection there were 2,100 schools in the islands and 5,000 students in attendance at the Manila university; when I find the better class living in good, substantial, and sometimes elegant houses, and many of them pursuing professional occupations I can not but conclude that it is a vile slander to compare these people to the Apaches or the American Indians."

"The best evidence of the ability of the Philippine people to govern themselves is that they possess a large intelligent class, thoroughly identified in interest with the islands, and capable of administering good government. The civil commission has recognized this ability by recently adding three native members to that governing body; by appointing three Filipino judges of the supreme court; by selecting about half of the judges of the first instance and nearly all the governors of the provinces from that race, and by appointing a solicitor-general and many other officers from the natives. Are these officials not in the

governing business, and do they not perform their work as well as the Americans? Is it possible that they are capable of governing because they were appointed by the representatives of a distant nation? Would they lose that ability if elected or chosen by properly constituted authority of their own? In the latter event they would make far better officers, because they would consult only the interest of their own people instead of that of a nation 7,000 miles away."

By force of arms we destroyed Aguinaldo's government, "arbitrary, tyrannical, military." Instead of trying to help the Filipinos build up a state, we began by destroying all that they had built. Was our government less tyrannical, less military, less arbitrary?

The following report of Gen. J. F. Bell, written at Christmas time in the year 1901, answers the question:

"I am now assembling in the neighborhood of 2,500 men who will be used in columns of about fifty men each. I take so large a command for the purpose of thoroughly searching each ravine, valley, and mountain peak for insurgents and for food, expecting to destroy everything I find outside of towns. All able-bodied men will be killed or captured. Old men, women, and children will be sent to towns. This movement begins January 1, by which time I hope to have nearly all the food supply in the towns. These people need a thrashing, to teach them some good common sense; and they should have it for the good of all concerned."

And that these ruthless measures have not been discontinued is apparent from the following order issued May 24, 1906, by Capt. Walter A. Smith, senior inspector of the constabulary of Negros, to the commanding officer of a squad consisting of fifteen or twenty men detailed to capture an outlaw named Isio:

"All country around Masasob, Manjulia, Magtacy, and other sitios in that locality must be covered and everything destroyed by cutting down or by fire. \* \* \* All people caught in these places should be turned over to Lieutenant Mohler for work. \* \* \* Have your men take lots of ammunition and kill everything that runs from the constabulary except women and children."

Yet Secretary Taft said at Grand Rapids that the Filipinos "are now enjoying the right to life, liberty, and property and the pursuit of happiness and freedom from deprivation of any of those rights, except by due process of law." Does Judge Taft, as an eminent lawyer, assert that the men whose prosperity is destroyed and whose lives are taken under such an order as this lose them by "due process of law?"

This last order was issued in time of peace, and is an illustration of our tenderness in dealing with a weaker people. This order was printed in the Manila Opinion, an American newspaper, on December 7, 1907. Has the officer who gave that order been punished? Could Aguinaldo's government have been more arbitrary?

The massacre of Mount Dajo, in March, 1906, where some 600 men, women, and children were slaughtered, was at least "military," if not "arbitrary and tyrannical."

Nor is this all. On July 4, 1902, President Roosevelt declared the war in the Philippines at an end and issued his proclamation of amnesty. Then "tranquillity" had been fully established. In the year 1902 reconcentration was used to suppress insurrection in Laguna and Batangas. It then affected not less than 100,000 people in camps holding from 8,000 to 14,000 people each, according to the official report of Colonel Wagner. In 1903, when every Filipino is said to have had all the civil rights secured to an American citizen by the bill of rights save the right to bear arms and to trial by jury, 300,000 persons were driven from their homes into reconcentration camps in Albay, where very large areas were entirely denuded of population. Fifteen thousand people in Tayabas suffered a like fate. In 1904 some 20,000 people in Samar and 16,000 in Cavite, close to the walls of Manila, were dealt with in like manner. In 1905 reports reached us of like operations. We heard from Bakoor that "its unfortunate reconcentrated people, the inhabitants of the districts of Ligas and St. Nicholas, a pleasant land situated by the seaside, are subjected to vigorous surveillance, and not allowed to walk abroad with impunity, obliged to snatch their sleep in motley heaps of men, women, and children, exposed by night and day to the elements" and every hardship which the terrible word "reconcentration" implies. Like reports came from Batangas, but these found no place in the dispatches from the Philippine Islands. We learned the facts from the Manila press.

Imagine 300,000 people charged with no crime taken from their homes anywhere in America because the Government wished to catch a gang of robbers. Would no constitutional right be invaded by such a process? What a mockery it is to claim that the Filipinos are secured in their civil rights when such barbarities are common. Secretary Taft is a good lawyer. Let him reconcile these facts with his claim.

And Aguinaldo's government was "full of corruption." How about our own? Secretary Taft's statement about Aguinaldo is a charge. There may be another side. His statement about our own Government is a confession. He says, "I am sorry to say that in the early days, when we were dependent on picking up what Americans we could, we did not give the Filipinos the best exhibition of our own regard for public welfare in office, for we had some sixteen provincial treasurers that became defaulters." The list of such crimes is larger now. A commander of the Filipino Scouts at the St. Louis Exposition has been convicted of forging vouchers, and instances might be multiplied. Are we Americans, with public officials everywhere on trial or under indictment, if not already convicted, with the Pennsylvania capitol, our great life insurance companies, our land frauds, and the whole melancholy catalogue, are we sure that our representatives in these distant islands are likely to prove more honest than our mayors, our senators, our bank presidents, our city treasurers at home? Filipinos by thousands were ready to give up their lives for their country's freedom. Is it not reasonable to suppose that in such a people there were men enough to appreciate that public office is a trust? We certainly have not governed the Filipinos better than they were governing themselves when we overthrew their government.

The practical effect of our policy may be judged from these statistics, which are taken from a letter addressed by representatives of Batangas to Secretary Taft on August 26, 1905. They show what has been going on in the municipality of Balayan, in the province of Batangas.

In 1896 the number of inhabitants in that municipality was 41,308. In 1905 it was 13,924. The area of cultivated land, in hectares, was 19,500 in 1896, and 1,700 in 1905—not 10 per cent. Products: Rice, 39,020 cavanes in 1896, and 12,500 cavanes in 1900; sugar, 520,000 picos in 1896, now 12,300 picos; maize, 110,000 cavanes in 1896, now 10,000 cavanes; the oxen then were 10,000, now 427; the cows then were 3,650, now 80; carabaos, oxen, 4,110 in 1896, now 433; carabaos, cows, 1,350 in 1896, now 92; there were 11,000 hogs then, there are now 2,800; there were 96,000 hens, there are now 5,000. Consider what a story these figures tell.



Only this autumn the Filipino Chamber of Commerce has sent to the municipalities a petition for signature which begins:

"Whereas it is palpable and notorious that the country is undergoing a period of serious and profound trial, especially in respect to agriculture,

"Whereas the condition of the fields this year gives the sad prospects of a harvest that will mean special poverty and hunger, in addition to the evils already experienced."

A government such as ours, whether we judge it by its methods or its results, can not succeed. We may build better roads, we may improve sewers, we may establish schools, we may teach better sanitation, and tax the Filipinos to pay for them, but after the catalogue of our good acts is complete we can not wipe from Filipino memories our past, nor can we avoid Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman's true statement, "Good government is no equivalent for self-government."

A great majority of American publicists, including the President, have declared themselves unequivocally in favor of Philippine independence. Mr. Taft alone, while setting it before his countrymen as the goal toward which we must look, seems not to desire it. He postpones the day for a generation at least, and when that time is gone he hopes that both countries will agree "that it would be mutually beneficial to continue a governmental relation between them like that between England and Australia." That is his hope, and so long as he can control our policy his object must be to realize that hope. As though it were possible for a country adapted only for the habitation of an alien race to hold a position toward a "parent nation" like that of a territory peopled and occupied by its own emigrants!

He prophesies "that during the next twenty-five years a development will take place in the agriculture and other business of the Philippine Islands which will be as remarkable in its benefits to the United States and the Philippine Islands as was the development of Alaska during the last ten or fifteen years."

He insists that "the presence of Americans in the islands is essential to the due development of the lower classes." He wants the American Government to remain in the islands "long enough to educate the entire people," which means an indefinite future when we consider how long it has taken and will take to educate our own people. He thinks that "meantime they will be able to see and the American public will come to see the enormous material benefit to both arising from the maintenance of some sort of a bond between the two countries." He insists that "the having such an outpost as the Philippines making the United States an Asiatic power for the time will be of immense benefit to its merchants and its trade." He recommends that "the present restrictions be removed as to the acquisition of mining claims and the holding of lands by corporations in the Philippines." He does not "think it improper in order to secure support for the policy of the Administration to point out the advantage to the United States of holding the islands." He wishes to attract American capital and to see American investments in railroads, mines, and plantations. He wishes, in a word, to plant as much American treasure in the islands as possible, knowing that where the treasure is the heart is, to make it as much for American interest to retain the islands as possible, and under cover of much vague talk about the benevolent purpose of the United States to fit the Filipinos for self-government, to pursue a policy which will create in America a strong sentiment against letting American investments go under Filipino control. Everyone knows that the demands of capital have led the English Government and others to conquer and annex foreign territory and no one can doubt that every American dollar planted in the Philippines will become an argument against their independence. Let Secretary Taft tell us in detail how these islands in twenty-five years are to become of such remarkable value to the United States—a value which could accrue only to a few exploiters who would doubtless enforce a demand for imported contract labor, driving the natives to the wall and benefiting themselves at the expense of the domestic industries of the United States—let Mr. Taft elucidate his programme fully and it will be apparent that the process means the permanence of our hold upon the islands.

While this development was proceeding for the advantage of a small group of capitalists, the absolute responsibility of the United States for the defense of the archipelago would continue. In the changed attitude of affairs in the East, which Mr. Taft ignores, this responsibility implies increased outlays for fortifications and an indefinitely increased naval force, of which the millions to be asked of the present Congress are only the small beginnings. If any one doubts that Mr. Taft's policy does not mean Philippine independence, let him observe that after the value of the islands to America has been demonstrated and the question of giving them their independence comes up for decision the Secretary bids us note "that the tribunal to decide whether the proper political capacity exists to justify independence is Congress and not the Philippine electorate." The judgment of a people as to their own political capacity is not an unerring guide. Can anyone be so blind as not to see what Secretary Taft's policy is and that it does not mean Philippine independence at all? Let the strong nation that finds the islands profitable decide whether to let them go? It is a bribed tribunal which will decide the question, and the policy of Secretary Taft is to create a situation which makes independence impossible. Is the judgment of a people as to another's political capacity more unerring than as to its own, especially when its own interests are at stake?

Secretary Taft may be right or wrong, but his real meaning is disguised by his talk of benevolence. In the words which Lincoln ascribed to tyrants, "The inferior race are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying, as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow;" they are to become invaluable to the United States, and our Congress is to decide whether they shall be given their independence. Well did Lincoln say, "It is all the same old serpent."

Through their own self-government now lies the road to Filipino independence and advancement. In the words of Lincoln, addressed prophetically to Mr. Taft, "By your system you would always keep them ignorant and vicious." In the words of President Roosevelt a year or two ago, "It is as true of a race as of an individual that while outsiders can help to a certain degree yet the real help must come in the shape of self-help." Men learn to be independent by being independent—by their own mistakes. To say that the object of our policy is to help the Filipinos to self-government and ultimate independence by making them as valuable to the United States as possible, and then letting the United States decide whether to give them independence is "to keep the word of promise to our ear and break it to our hope." We assume the position of trustee for this nation and unfit ourselves to discharge our trust impartially. The statesman who proposes this may deceive himself, but we must not let him deceive us.

It is for the interest of both countries that the Philippines be given their independence now. To-day the United States can obtain

without doubt from the powers, including Japan, a consent to the neutralization of the islands, a protection of their independence from foreign aggression. A few years hence that consent may not be obtained. The time is ripe for the passage of a joint resolution declaring our intention to grant the Filipinos absolute independence within a short term of years. Every year's delay is dangerous, and dangerous to us.

The forces which make for Filipino independence are irresistible. "The mills of God grind slowly," and for a time we may hold these islands, as for a time we held the negroes in slavery. The interests which made for the preservation and extension of slavery were strong, far stronger than any interest which we now have in holding the Philippines, but they were not strong enough. The fortunes which were invested in slaves were lost, and no nation ever paid dearer for wrong than did this nation by the civil war and its indelible effects. So also will it happen again. The dollars and the lives spent to hold these islands will be wasted, the fortunes invested there will be lost, and the longer we delay to do them justice the greater the penalty we must pay. We are sinning against light. Soft words and fair promises can not prevail.

For He that worketh high and wise,  
Nor pauses in His plan,  
Will take the sun out of the skies  
Ere freedom out of man.

Mr. Taft, at Grand Rapids, spoke of the "unreasonable opposition and the almost traitorous sympathy with the opposition to our Government in the Philippines displayed by the anti-imperialists." Is it indeed treason in any American to sympathize with the aspirations of a people for liberty; to assert the self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence—to resist those who, in Lincoln's words, would "turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism?" Are such words as these becoming in a man who aspires to be the Chief Magistrate of a free nation?

History again repeats itself. In 1854 a Senator from Tennessee charged that Boston was "filled with traitors," meaning those of her citizens who were opposed to slavery. Charles Sumner's reply may be used again to answer Secretary Taft. "The charge is not new. Boston of old was the home of Hancock and Adams. Her traitors now are those who are truly animated by the spirit of the American Revolution. In condemning them, in condemning Massachusetts, in condemning these remonstrants, you simply give proper conclusion to the utterance on this floor that the Declaration of Independence is a self-evident lie."

Finally, Secretary Taft at Grand Rapids said, "Is there room for doubt that Abraham Lincoln would have approved the policy of McKinley and Roosevelt in maintaining our position as a world power, in increasing the size of our Navy, so that when we do intervene in international affairs we may exercise an influence commensurate with our greatness as a nation?" Against this lamentable doctrine of might, which makes our greatness depend on guns and ships, we would oppose the true faith that "righteousness exalteth a nation;" that a scrupulous regard for the rights of others, however weak and whatever their race or color, a consistent policy of justice to all men, an example of ordered freedom, will give us a far more powerful influence on mankind and make us a far greater world power than all the guns and all the ships that our enormous wealth can buy. We would have our country and its influence such as Emerson described in speaking of Boston and Massachusetts:

"Pole-star of light in Europe's night  
That never faltered from the right.  
Kings shook with fear; old empires crave  
The secret force to find,  
Which fired the little State to save  
The rights of all mankind."

Let us hope that this fire will ever burn in Massachusetts, and that she will never lack such traitors as Adams, Sumner, Hoar, and Boutwell to keep it alight.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the second place, Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to print as a part of my remarks a petition and memorial to the Congress of the United States by the Association of Friends of the city of Philadelphia, remonstrating against the authorization at this session of Congress of the building of four new battle ships.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The document referred to is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia respectfully enters an earnest protest against the authorization at this session of Congress of the building of four new battle ships, with cruisers, docks, etc., aggregating an expenditure in excess of \$60,000,000.

Your remonstrants urge the following considerations in support of their protest:

#### NATIONAL PERIL ONLY JUSTIFICATION OF A GREAT NAVY.

The unprecedented rapid growth of our Navy can be justified on grounds of grave national peril only.

#### ACTION OF SECOND HAGUE CONGRESS LESSENS NEED OF NAVY.

No such peril appears in any direction. On the contrary, within a year the action of the second Hague conference did away with the bombardment of unfortified towns, and three-fourths of the countries of the world went on record as advocating the protection of private property at sea in time of war; assurance was given of the establishment of a court of nations at The Hague, and the cause of international arbitration treaties received renewed life.

#### ALL FOREIGN RELATIONS NOW AMICABLE.

The relations of our Government with other countries are amicable and give promise of stable peace. Those in positions of authority and knowledge in America and in Japan assure us that the recent questions at issue have never threatened a break in the friendly relations of the two countries, but that the deplorable agitation of the public mind was created by misinformed persons and a sensational press.

#### GREAT NAVY MEANS INCREASED BURDEN FOR UNPRODUCTIVE PURPOSES.

The vast and constantly increasing expenditure for naval purposes is adding to the burden of taxation in a time of financial uncertainty and business depression.

Such expenditure diverts national revenue from useful and produc-

tive projects of internal development and improvement now urgently demanded by the needs of the country to facilitate commerce and promote the general welfare.

#### PACIFIC RELATIONS IN PAST DUE TO NATIONAL PROBITY.

History teaches that the immunity from foreign wars and aggression enjoyed by our country is due not to a great navy and an imposing military establishment, but to our national policy of friendliness, candor, and pure intent in international affairs. This policy has made "American diplomacy" a term of honor among nations.

#### NAVAL EXPANSION UN-AMERICAN.

The policy of naval and military expansion is new to our country. It suggests a change of base from the principles of our fathers, an attitude of unrest, self-assertion, and display that is undignified and out of keeping with our national genius.

#### UNITED STATES A REFUGE FOR WAR-BURDENED FOREIGNERS.

A large and rapidly increasing part of our population has come to the United States to escape economic, social, and governmental conditions created by military burdens and the inheritance of old wars. These citizens are not in sympathy with a movement to restore them to a condition from which they sacrificed much to be free.

#### APPEAL TO BRUTE FORCE SELDOM FINAL.

There is a growing sentiment, already widely entertained, that war is a barbarous method that settles controversies on a basis of mere physical force and not of justice and righteousness. Arbitration, on the contrary, appeals strongly to our people as a method based on equity and reason.

#### JUDICIAL APPEAL INCREASINGLY EFFECTIVE.

By reason of the progress of recent years, and the facilities afforded at The Hague, international arbitration is as much a part of the world's government as the law courts are part of the national life. For two civilized nations to rush into arms over a controversy that can be settled rightly only by judicial action is regarded now as an act of criminal folly.

#### PRESENT NAVY ADEQUATE FOR POLICE PURPOSES.

Hence it appears that the naval force should be regarded only as national police. Your remonstrants believe that our present Navy is amply large for this purpose, and should not be increased. Any large addition to our present force is likely to become a menace and source of danger rather than a protection.

#### SUMMARY.

Therefore your remonstrants urge upon you, as chosen representatives of the people, the defeat of this proposed legislation, because they believe it to be inexpedient and unnecessary, wasteful of the national revenue, contrary to our historical development and national genius, at variance with the sentiment of a large proportion of the people of the United States, and contrary to the international policy of a Christian nation that has stood before the world as a leader in peace and an exponent of justice and friendliness.

Signed by authority and on behalf of the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia.

JOHN B. GARRETT, *President*.  
STANLEY R. YARNALL, *Vice-President*.  
JOSHUA L. BAILY.  
ISAAC SHARPLESS.

PEACE ASSOCIATION OF FRIENDS OF PHILADELPHIA,  
20 South Twelfth street.

H. W. CADBURY, *Secretary*.

PHILADELPHIA, Third Month, 9th, 1908.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the country, and I believe that the Members of the House upon the Republican side of the aisle will agree with me that, acting as minority leader, thus far this session I have given the majority perfectly "smooth sailing." I have not wanted to be regarded as factious; I have not wanted the country to think that the minority on this side was trying to assume responsibility for legislation. I knew that responsibility rested with the majority, and I did not want to appear to coerce the majority—and very little coercing can the minority do—until that majority had made absolute demonstration before the country of the fact that it does not intend to do anything at his session of Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And that, too, notwithstanding the fact that your President has issued a programme that he calls upon you to execute, and notwithstanding the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HERRN] announced early in the session that unless you did execute that programme somebody was going to "get run over" and "get hurt."

I have waited like a Democratic lamb ready for the slaughter, waiting for the Republican party to do something. I have finally come to the conclusion that the Republican party in this House has forgotten how to do anything; it has become the party of negation, of passivity, and, as far as I can see, has no idea of doing anything. [Applause on Democratic side.] It is plain now that without some method of parliamentary coercion you are going to be deaf to every demand of the country. The minority can not exercise much power, but it has some power, and I want to make the announcement now, that from this moment on to the balance of this session this is not going to be a lie-easy, wait-on-the-enemy campaign [applause on the Democratic side], and that the little parliamentary power the minority has under the rules is going to be exercised. The minority has a right to refuse unanimous consent to legislation. It has the right to call for the yeas and nays upon every affirmative matter of legislation. I now make the announcement that no requests for unanimous consent from that side of the aisle,

unless it be to adjourn or to take a recess—in which two cases I believe it is not from a parliamentary standpoint necessary to have unanimous consent—will not be granted during the balance of this session until the majority shows that it is alive to the demands of the country sufficiently to report for consideration in this House, or to give me satisfactory assurance that they will report for consideration, the following bills:

First, an employers' liability bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You have been wasting too much time over it. You have been permitting your Judiciary Committee to have hearing upon hearing, and you have been using that bill merely as a buffer in order to prevent hearing upon other essential legislation before that committee, which legislation you hope to evade.

Second, I shall refuse unanimous consent until you report to this House for its consideration some publicity of campaign contributions bill [applause on the Democratic side], whether it be the bill offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] or some other bill. I care not whose name is attached to it, Republican or Democrat.

Third, I shall refuse unanimous consent for any request upon that side of the Chamber until the Ways and Means Committee of this House, in response to the overwhelming demand of the entire newspaper and magazine fraternity of this country, Republican as well as Democrat, shall bring to the consideration of this House a bill for free wood pulp and free print paper. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Fourth, I shall make the same declination until the Clayton bill, now pending before the Judiciary Committee, or some other bill embodying like provisions, shall have been reported out of that committee for the consideration of this House. What the Clayton bill does is this: It prevents mere ex parte and temporary injunctions, where only one side has been heard from, acting as a supersedeas of a law passed by a sovereign State.

I do not deny the right, upon final hearing of the injunction when it is made permanent, to set aside a State law, if in the opinion of a Federal court it violates the Constitution of the United States, but I do deny the right, upon a mere ex parte hearing by means of a temporary injunction without hearing the State's side at all, of a subordinate court of the United States to sit in judgment on the constitutionality of the legislation of a sovereign State. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am reinforced in that opinion by the fact that under the original judicial act of the courts had no such power, and for years and years afterwards had no such power, and could not issue an injunction until they had heard both sides, with reasonable notice to both sides. Mr. Chairman, in order that there may be no misunderstanding about that, and how far I am going, I desire to read this Clayton bill, though I do not insist upon this particular bill. Bring in a bill in the name of the chairman of the committee; bring in a bill in the name of a Republican, claim the credit for it, go before the country and get the credit for it—you have a right to do it; that I admit, and I would be glad to see you do it, for I am never better satisfied than at the unusual spectacle of the Republican party serving the country. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The Clayton bill is as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That hereafter it shall be unlawful for any circuit or district court of the United States or any circuit or district judge of the United States to issue any injunction or order prohibiting or restraining the execution of any State law in all cases except where final trial has been had and final judgment or final decree has been rendered declaring such State law to be in violation of the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.

Sec. 2. That hereafter it shall be unlawful for any circuit or district court or any circuit or district judge of the United States to issue any injunction or restraining order prohibiting or restraining any State officers or any persons from executing any State law in all cases except where final trial has been had and final judgment or final decree has been rendered declaring such State law to be in violation of the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.

Thomas Jefferson said we ought to preserve the rights of the States as the best security for individual liberty and local self-government. He also stated that we ought to guard with equal care the delegated powers of the Federal Government as our only safeguard for national independence and national peace and progress. I would not take from the Federal Government one of the powers that have been delegated to it. I would not for a moment join in an attack upon the courts of the United States for declaring a State law or a Federal law unconstitutional when in their honest opinion they deem it to be so, but I do say that it is as little as any man who loves his State and believes in local self-government can demand to ask that no mere subordinate Federal court should exercise this newly derived power to set aside an act of a State upon a mere ex parte hearing from the attorneys and the witnesses of a railroad corporation or of anybody else, much less to forbid a State to be



heard in its own defense. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, Mr. Chairman, if after some time I do not notice signs of amendment on that side of the Chamber and a disposition to do something—to quit this policy of passivity and mere negation and “stand-patism”—if I do not note some disposition to awake to the idea that you are representatives of the American people and ought to be doing something in their interests, then I shall use about the only other power that the minority has, and that is to call for a yea-and-nay vote upon every affirmative proposition, however insignificant, presented to this House for passage. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration carries a total appropriation of \$11,431,346, the amount deemed necessary by the committee to meet the legitimate growth of the work of the Department of Agriculture for the coming fiscal year. This Department directs its efforts to the improvement and conservation of the nation's predominant industry. The problems of agriculture cover a vast expanse of territory and involve every phase of farm life. Forty millions of our people, with an invested capital of over \$25,000,000,000, coax from the soil their happiness and prosperity and at the same time supply a never-failing source of permanent wealth to the nation. The true measure of the industrial greatness of any country is the size of the bank books of its farmers, and their natural, inherent conservatism is the true gauge of the character, stability, and morale of its citizenship.

To increase the prosperity of these people, to solve the problems of their great occupation, to get a maximum return from the latent possibilities of the soil, to conserve the fruits of years of labor, and to blaze a pathway into new fields of conquest, is the work of the Department of Agriculture. Fundamentally it is missionary and educational. To agriculture it is a veritable John the Baptist, whose zealous preachments are working a revolution in farm conditions, while at the same time it is a great university whose teachings are the inspiration and guidance of the farmers of the country. To teach and to lead more than 36 per cent of our population to a more complete dominion over nature, to bring them into the fullest possession of God's richest bequeathment, is the province of this arm of the Government's service. Such is the great work, the most comprehensive in scope and possible results, this Department undertakes to do, and, happily for the well-being of the nation, it does it in a great and comprehensive way.

Because of the very character of the work of the Department it is not possible to measure in mere dollars the value of its work to the country, but we do know that it has helped to send the farm boy and farm girl to college, put music in the farm home, planted flowers in the farmyard, and made farm life attractive and profitable. We know it has improved general farm conditions, set in motion new thoughts, awakened new ambitions, planted new hopes, quickened endeavor, added dignity, and brought to the farmer as a class a new independence. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, there is a disposition to criticize and find fault with this bill. It is said the increases carried by it are unusually large. We are told that the country is in a state of panic, that we are facing a deficit in the Treasury, and the pruning knife must be put to all appropriations.

It is true that the country is in a state of panic, but whose panic is it? Who brought it about? I do not hear of any farmers reducing wages or dismissing their employees; I see no account of cessation of farm operations because of hard times, nor have I read of any farmer blowing out his brains because of failures. His productions last year were the greatest in the life of the nation. There was no decrease in his contribution to the national wealth. It is not the farmer's panic; he is not responsible for it, and no friend of agriculture can justify a vote to curtail and hamper the admirable work of the farmers' department of the Government, because, forsooth, the speculators and stock gamblers of Wall street are having a row, and are now engaged in the delightful pastime of swallowing each other. Let me call the attention of the critics of this bill to the fact that the farmer will continue to make his annual contribution to the nation's exchequer in spite of railroad wars, crashing banks, depreciating stocks and bonds, and financial crises. [Applause.]

Let me impress upon them that his brain and brawn produced a crop last year the value of which was \$7,500,000,000, approximately as much as the combined capital of the manufacturing establishments of this country, and that they sold products abroad valued at over \$1,000,000,000, which brought back to the nation as a balance of trade \$444,000,000. These gentlemen who would make the farmer help bear the burden of a self-made political stock-gamblers' panic by cutting the appropriations in this bill forget or do not appreciate the fact that it is to the farmer that this nation owes supremacy in the markets

of the world; that he makes the balance in favor of the United States in her international trade relations. [Applause.]

It is true that a deficit in the Treasury threatens us, but I would remind gentlemen that it is not the result of extravagant appropriations to the Department of Agriculture. Compared to other appropriations, the amount carried by this bill is a mere insignificant bagatelle. The total appropriations for all purposes for the second session of the Fifty-ninth Congress were \$919,948,679.63, of which agriculture received \$9,447,290, or about one dollar out of every one hundred appropriated, and the same ratio will be maintained in the appropriations of this Congress. It may be wise legislation to appropriate \$145,937,000 for pensions and at the same time appropriate only \$37,183,093, and that only every other year, for the great work of improving our rivers and harbors—the nation's highways of commerce; it may be wise statesmanship to appropriate millions for the District of Columbia, the Indians, and the diplomatic and consular service every year, while appropriations for needed public buildings throughout the country must await a plethoric condition of the Treasury; it may be good policy to appropriate approximately \$200,000,000 annually for the support of the Army and naval services, while only a little over \$11,000,000 are intrusted to the Department of Agriculture for its work in the aid of the most important and fundamental industry of the nation. The excuse given by gentlemen of statesmanship pretensions who each year, uncomplainingly and without fault-finding, vote this enormous burden upon the taxpayers for the maintenance of the Army and Navy, is that the one guarantees internal peace and order, while the other is a protection against external dangers.

Oh, statesmanship, the follies committed in thy name! If gentlemen would insure internal peace and order, if they would anchor this nation securely and forever to its ancient constitutional moorings, if they would protect it from the dangerous restlessness of overcrowded city conditions, if they would insure it with strength and permanent stability, let them look to the welfare of the farmer, to the improvement of his condition, to the bettering of his homelife and to the making of his great occupation profitable, for after all the full smokehouse and corncrib are the nation's surest safeguard! [Applause.] Give to the nation a great army of happy and contented farmers, equip its great industrial classes with prosperity, keep full their dinner pails by wise and patriotic legislation, and the necessity for a burdensome standing army ceases to exist. [Applause.]

But gentlemen argue that internal peace is no defense against external dangers and assert, with the emphasis of profound belief, that a great navy must stand between us and the warlike nations of the earth. This thought has moved them to increase enormously the strength of the Navy in recent years and to ask even greater increases for the future. These gentlemen, and I have every confidence in their integrity of belief, would add \$40,000,000 to the present naval bill to provide four additional first-class battle ships. I do not disagree to a programme which looks to a gradual increase in the naval strength of the country, but I confess a doubt as to the wisdom of an attempt to establish an efficient navy in a day. I am inclined to disagree, too, with the idea that a great navy affords us any guaranty of permanent peace with the world. The bully who carries a chip on his shoulder is apt to find some one willing to undertake to knock it off, and whether a great navy is a security or a menace is, in the minds of our most conservative thinkers, a debatable question. But everyone agrees, even the jingo and alarmist, that no nation which is dependent in a large measure upon ours for its food and clothing is likely to be hasty in precipitating a quarrel with us.

You may not like the grocer or the dry goods merchant, who are your only sources of supply for the prime necessities of life; you may have a positive dislike for them, but the strong probability is that you will be careful about communicating the fact to them. And, Mr. Chairman, as long as the United States furnishes the world 34 per cent of its corn, 24 per cent of its wheat, 45.27 per cent of its meat products, and 66.6 per cent of its cotton, so long will the world hesitate to precipitate a disturbance with us. I put against the Army and the Navy, as instrumentalities of defense, against dangers from within and from without, the continued prosperity of our agricultural classes, and I assert that in the ratio of their prosperity are we, as a nation, bulwarked against danger. Make the farmer happy, cause his fields to yield an abundance sufficient for the needs of his own country and for the major supply of the world's needs and you have such a guaranty of peace as can not be furnished by standing armies and navies. America's agricultural prosperity means international peace. [Applause.]

The South has a special interest in this bill. More than 57 per cent of her 10,000,000 people employed in gainful occupa-

tions are directly engaged in agricultural operations and at least one-half of the remaining population trace their employment directly to the farm.

No territory of like dimension in all the world affords such limitless agricultural possibilities—and to none is agriculture of such vast importance.

The dazzling, almost romantic growth of manufacturing in the South since 1880, when it had its real beginning, gives some justification for the idea that the South is forsaking its first and oldest love—agriculture—for this brilliant and newer courtier—manufacturing. The capital invested in farm property in these States is four times greater than that employed in manufacturing and the ratio of population engaged in the two occupations differs even more widely. Agriculture is and will continue to be the predominant occupation of the Southern people, even though our progress in manufacturing in the last thirty years and our natural advantages give a reasonable expectancy that the South is to become the center of this great industry, with respect to cotton manufacturing at least.

Fifty years ago the conservative thought of the country was settled in the conviction that the successful manufacture of raw cotton in the South was impossible. It was only the "irrational dreamer" who had the temerity to predict the day when the cotton mill would move to the cotton field, and I now put myself in that class by making bold to prophesy that the next fifty years will see the bulk of the cotton crop of this country made into the finished product in the South, and I am willing for our brief record in this new field and the logic of the situation speak for me.

According to Mr. R. H. Edmonds, editor of the *Manufacturer's Record*, the South from 1880 to 1905 increased the number of its spindles from 667,000 to 9,205,000, and its raw cotton consumption from 225,000 to 2,163,000 bales, only a little short of the consumption of the New England mills, and its capital invested from \$21,000,000 to \$220,000,000, while a Southern State, South Carolina, reached second place among the States of the Union in this industry. This is the record of less than one-third of a century, and it is unprecedented, unparalleled, unapproached in the history of this business. [Applause.]

This achievement, if it is indicative of anything, means that the South is not only to monopolize the production of raw cotton, but control its manufacture. In every essential of successful manufacture of cotton the South has the advantage over the New England States. Her labor is cheaper and as productive, her climate is less severe, while the number and magnitude of her water powers, with the proximity of her coal and iron deposits, give her a natural asset unequaled, not alone by New England, but by the world, and when to these are added the presence of the cotton field itself and her innumerable navigable streams, the cheapest mode of transportation, every possible advantage is hers in the struggle for supremacy in this great industry. These natural advantages, this sacred heritage, the reawakened energies and confident hopes of her people shall fashion into a wealth and happiness all their own. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, rich in industrial potentialities as is the South, she is vastly more rich in agricultural possibilities. To us, who are filled with enthusiasm for the future for this great occupation in this section, these possibilities seem unlimited. The imagination does not exist which can portray the agriculture of the South fifty years from to-day if the progress of the last few years is maintained. With her mild and evenly balanced climate, permitting outdoor labor at every season of the year, her fertile soil, capable of producing profitably every crop known to the Temperate and Semitorrid zones, with her abundant rainfall and her vast undeveloped area of farm lands, she possesses all the elements which must be present in the creation of a great agricultural empire. That she is to become such an empire is evidenced in her marvelous agricultural progress since the civil war, and in the confident, enthusiastic, and triumphant optimism of her agricultural classes.

It is impossible to form a clear conception of the progress of Southern agriculture or the dormant possibilities it holds for future development without the necessity of recalling the fearful devastation wrought to farm values by the bloodiest and the most unfortunate of the world's tragedies.

The total of farm values in the South in 1860 was \$2,880,000,000, while for 1870 these values were only \$1,648,000,000, or a decrease of 42.2 per cent in the brief period of ten years, the darkest that ever visited any section in the history of God's children. In the twinkling of an eye, for a decade is hardly that in the life of a nation, almost one-half of the accumulated earnings, the conservation of two centuries of genius and labor, was swallowed up in the terrible tempest of war and the more destructive saturnalia of maladministration and flagrant misrule.

During the same period the value of all Southern property showed a decrease of more than \$2,000,000,000, almost one-half, and "through the death and permanent invalidism of at least 300,000 of the very pick and flower of its people," Mr. R. H. Edmonds, an undisputed authority, estimates an additional loss to this scourged section of \$3,000,000,000 of wealth, "wealth far more real than coal and iron and timber, stocks and bonds, for men of character and energy, not natural resources, are the true wealth of a country," and I quote the same authority for the statement that, "2,500,000 Southern-born whites were forced by conditions more appalling than any nation in modern times ever faced, worse even than conditions that prevail in Russia," to emigrate to more inviting fields, and if the usual economic value of \$10,000 for a man is allowed, we must charge to the insatiable appetite of war and reconstruction the consumption of \$25,000,000,000 more of the real wealth of the South. The sum total of Southern loss in wealth in the actual depreciation in the values of property, in the death and emigration of its productive agencies, aggregates the stupendous sum of \$30,000,000,000, \$5,000,000,000 more than the total agricultural wealth of the whole country to-day, two and one-half times more than the capital invested in all the railroads of the country, more than three times that engaged in all the manufacturing establishments of the nation, and nearly one-third of the present total wealth of the United States. Appalling as are these facts, they fail to furnish a complete portrayal of the actual conditions.

A revolution as complete as ever blotted out a civilization or gave birth to a new dynasty was forced upon the South. That courageous, patient, conservative statesmanship which, for sixty out of seventy years, gave her an undisputed leadership in shaping the destiny of the nation was now denied the poor privilege of a voice in guiding her own, while 4,000,000 former slaves were turned loose upon her with every right of citizenship enjoyed by the white man, with none of his capacities for the right using of them.

Backed by Federal bayonets, urged on by misguided fanaticism, and aided in his devilry by the carpetbagger and the more damnable scalawag, the unchained rapacity of the ignorant negro gorged itself upon the little property that remained to the South from the war's devastation. The brazen adventurer and the unshamed traitor enriched themselves at her expense, while to meet the demands of plunderers, taxation was raised to the point of confiscation, justice was bartered as a commodity of commercial value, official place was bought and sold, vice sat upon the throne of virtue, ignorance wore the crown of intelligence, and the cloven feet of vandalism pressed upon the neck of patriotism.

The South was as one stupefied, groping in the dark, knowing not what the morrow would bring forth or what dread disaster might come through the night, while capital, coward as it always is, sought place of safety, investment, other fields of employment, and the wheels of progress stood still. There never was a darker day for the South, and never was there a blacker chapter added to the glorious record of our matchless national life, and I would, Mr. Chairman, that there was some power to blot it from our history and our memories, and I know that I but express the wish of every son whose brave father faced mine in the fierce fire of battle. [Applause.]

To this great section, nothing was saved from the terrible holocaust of war and reconstruction except those indestructible elements essential to all national greatness, the natural resources with which God had endowed it, and the grim determination, courage, and genius of its people. [Applause.]

In 1870 the seemingly dead body politic gave evidence of returning life. Oppression had gone too far, the Southern white man was aroused, and his capacity for rule, his hatred of tyranny, his love for local self-government, asserted themselves, and in a peaceful revolution the reign of ignorance and corruption was overthrown and the Southern State governments were put back into the hands of the virtue and intelligence of their own people. [Applause.]

The hope that inspired this struggle and the courage which won this victory gave agriculture a new confidence and an assurance that investment and labor should find protection and reward under the law.

By 1880 the value of Southern property had reached \$2,343,000,000, over \$500,000,000 short of the farm values at the beginning of the war, and by 1890 Southern agriculture had fully reached the status it possessed in 1860.

In the brief space of a human life the sturdy Southern farmer—and man for man, opportunity for opportunity, he has no superior on earth—under unparalleled adverse conditions, in the teeth of hostile legislation, laboring under the burden of confiscatory taxation, handicapped by the process of transition



from a state of measurable dependence upon the negro for support to a reliance upon his own brain and muscle, and in the face of criticism and prejudice, had laid for himself a foundation, not only equal to that upon which he stood thirty years before, but had laid it infinitely more broadly and deeply, in that it was predicated upon intelligent and productive as against ignorant and comparatively unproductive labor. [Applause.]

The so-called "Old South," and I say it with all deference to the sacredness and glory that term implies, industrially, was largely the product of a system of labor necessarily based upon a low order of intelligence, while the so-called "New South"—a misnomer which I spurn and despise—is to be what its white labor and intelligence make it.

But, Mr. Chairman, the past is history and memories; the future is opportunity.

And what boundless opportunities, what limitless possibilities are there in the varied agricultural resources of the South awaiting the touch of trained intellects and the application of scientific businesslike farm methods.

In the extent of its territory, the fertility of its soil, and the wonderful variety of its farm products the South verily is unapproached by any other section of this country or of the world, and in the possibilities it offers for ideal farm conditions it is likewise without rival.

The great staple money crop of the South is cotton, which in many respects is the world's greatest crop. The money value of it in 1907 approximates the enormous sum of \$800,000,000. It furnishes 30 per cent of the total value of American exports and brings from Europe more than \$400,000,000 annually—a princely tribute of over \$1,000,000 each day of the year.

Has the South reached its maximum of cotton production? That is a question of gravest importance, alike to the South itself and to this country and the world. The pessimist, along with many conservative men, through a lack of understanding of the real conditions, sees in the enormous yield of the past few years the limit of development for this crop. This is not a new thought, for as early as 1823, when the total crop amounted to 509,600 bales of 300 pounds each, the statisticians of Liverpool proved to their own satisfaction that in consequence of the abolition of the slave trade the maximum production of cotton had then been reached. Another example of the fact that figures may, lie. The truth is, this great industry is in the very infancy of its development. The Southern people are just learning how to grow cotton, how to market it, how to make it the regal crop its importance to the comfort and happiness of mankind entitle it to become.

In the last quarter of a century the number of acres planted has increased 100 per cent, bales produced 188 per cent, and the value of the crop more than 155 per cent—a growth which points to a continued development both in the magnitude and value of this imperial industry. It must be borne in mind also in this connection that the average yield per acre, about 210 pounds lint, is steadily increasing, although it is far from the maximum or even the yield of the more intelligently cultivated and improved farms of the Southern growers. The highest yield from 1 acre of which any record exists is 2,000 pounds lint, and two bales per acre is coming to be regarded as not an uncommon yield among the best farmers of the South.

The maximum of production will be reached only when the present average yield reaches the average yield of the more improved farm. That this result is to come is just as certain as intelligence, care, and improved methods always work revolutions upward. I confidently expect to see the South produce 30,000,000 bales of cotton per annum, with a value proportionately great. To do this there will be little increase in acreage and only the natural increase in labor supply will be necessary. The result is to be had by increasing the yield per acre, by the bringing of the average to the maximum, through improved farm methods, a more thorough understanding of seed selection, a greater knowledge of soil conditions and fertilizer problems, a more general appreciation of crop rotation and diversification, and the recognition of live stock as an indispensable factor in all successful agriculture. In every one of these essentials the South is undergoing a veritable revolution.

But, Mr. Chairman, will the world ever need 30,000,000 bales of cotton? The pessimist again says, "No." Optimist as I am I am just as emphatic in believing and asserting the contrary.

It is an economic principle that demand makes supply. In accordance with such a principle cotton production must go pari passu with the world's need for cotton. Fifty years ago the wants of the world were satisfied with 2,500,000 bales; today she demands the production of 20,000,000 bales, according to

the Census Bureau, two-thirds of which must come from the South. In the last twenty years the consumption of cotton has nearly doubled, and if a proportionate increase in demand continues for a like period the South must produce 26,000,000 bales to meet it. Of the four great staples that provide man with clothing, cotton is the cheapest and comes nearest meeting the demands of every people and clime, and therefore the markets for cotton goods are steadily broadening, new markets opening up, new territory is being invaded, and new people converted to an appreciation of cotton as a clothing material. It is estimated that of the world's population of 1,500,000,000 only 500,000,000 wear clothes regularly, while 750,000,000 are only partly clothed and 250,000,000 live in comparative nakedness.

The great bulk of the unclothed and only partly clothed people of the world live in the torrid and semitorrid zones, for which cotton is the ideal clothing material. The advance in the civilization of these people means a demand for dress in accordance with the standards of civilization, for the clothing of a nation in a way measures its civilization. Statisticians agree that it will take 42,000,000 bales of cotton per year to clothe the human family in keeping with the average dress of its more advanced people. This marks the need of the world to-day for clothing, and the demand for it is just so sure to come as civilization is certain to advance. This is the South's field for conquest. [Applause.]

I trust, Mr. Chairman, it will not be considered out of place for me to correct the idea that the agriculture of the South must of necessity be confined to cotton growing, and that its soil and climatic conditions act as a bar to the successful growing of the other great staple crops of the country—wheat, oats, corn, hay, and cattle. Cotton will always be primary and predominant, but as secondary and defensive crops profit may be had in growing these other crops. That this is true is demonstrated by an examination of their history in the South during the last twenty-five years, and for this purpose I desire to submit a carefully prepared table showing the progress of wheat growing in the United States as compared to the Southern States, and of Minnesota and Kansas as compared to South Carolina.

*Average annual production from three years' crops.*

Wheat.	Years.	Bushels.		Acres.		Bushels.	
		Number.	Increase.	Number.	Increase.	Per acre.	Increase per acre.
			<i>Per cent.</i>		<i>Per cent.</i>		<i>Per cent.</i>
United States.	1880-82	462,005,143		87,587,644		12.3	
	1905-07	687,442,489	48.8	46,790,908	24.5	14.7	19.5
Ten Southern States.	1880-82	44,224,770		5,584,497		7.9	
	1905-07	48,634,298	10.0	4,765,479	-14.7	10.2	28.9
South Carolina	1880-82	1,195,510		195,017		6.1	
	1905-07	2,523,799	111.1	316,901	62.5	8.0	29.9
Minnesota	1880-82	36,459,399		2,919,733		12.5	
	1905-07	65,278,608	79.0	5,255,198	80.0	12.4	-0.4
Kansas	1880-82	23,831,000		1,934,857		12.3	
	1905-07	74,813,572	213.9	5,639,204	191.5	13.5	7.7

It is seen that the acreage in wheat for the United States has increased 24.4 per cent, and for the Southern States there is a decrease of 14.7 per cent; for the United States there is an increase of 48.8 per cent in bushels produced and only 10 per cent for the Southern States, and an increase in yield per acre for the United States of 19.5 per cent and 28.9 per cent for the Southern States. The significance of these figures is that while there has been an actual decrease in acreage and only 10 per cent increase in bushels produced for the Southern States, as compared to large increases in both of these directions for the United States, the Southern States, in production per acre, show much greater increase than is shown for the United States. In the essential of successful agriculture, increase in yield per acre, the South shows its greatest comparative progress, and this serves as the best evidence of what can be done.

In the comparison of South Carolina with Minnesota and Kansas the same significant fact stands out—a large increase, 29.9 per cent in production per acre, against a slight increase for Kansas and an actual decrease of 4 per cent for Minnesota. The logic of these figures is that if Minnesota continues to decrease in yield per acre, while South Carolina continues to increase in the same ratio as in the period covered, the time is not distant when the production per acre in South Carolina will equal that of Minnesota and Kansas. But these facts fail to do full justice to the possibilities for wheat growing in the South, for, while her average production per acre is only 10.2 bushels, it is a fact known of all men that under proper methods of preparation and cultivation from 25 to 40 bushels can easily be

grown in any of the Southern States. It is only a question of raising the average in the direction of the maximum yield, and this is to come as the result of the revolution going on in general agriculture in the South. What is true of wheat is likewise true of oats and corn, as the following tables will show:

*Average annual production from three years' crops.*

Oats.	Years.	Bushels.		Acres.		Bushels.	
		Number.	Increase.	Number.	Increase.	Per acre.	Increase per acre.
			<i>Per cent.</i>		<i>Per cent.</i>		<i>Per cent.</i>
United States	1880-82	440,872,330		17,171,423		25.7	
	1905-07	890,854,573	102.1	30,280,838	76.3	29.4	14.6
Twelve Southern States	1880-82	51,955,777		4,132,338		12.6	
	1905-07	53,940,117	3.8	2,461,000	-40.4	21.9	74.3
South Carolina	1880-82	3,733,707		309,983		12.3	
	1905-07	3,498,230	-6.4	191,256	-37.1	18.3	48.7
Illinois	1880-82	76,060,503		2,131,171		35.7	
	1905-07	114,072,754	50.0	3,847,758	80.5	29.6	-16.9

  

Corn.	Years.	Bushels.		Acres.		Bushels.	
		Number.	Increase.	Number.	Increase.	Per acre.	Increase per acre.
			<i>Per cent.</i>		<i>Per cent.</i>		<i>Per cent.</i>
United States	1880-82	1,509,791,881		64,079,804		23.6	
	1905-07	2,742,576,544	81.7	99,836,317	51.2	28.3	19.0
Twelve Southern States	1880-82	385,086,302		23,183,194		16.6	
	1905-07	671,541,769	74.4	33,813,456	45.8	19.9	19.6
South Carolina	1880-82	12,303,700		1,311,052		9.4	
	1905-07	24,633,031	100.2	1,929,445	47.2	12.8	36.1
Iowa	1880-82	202,956,480		6,778,227		29.9	
	1905-07	316,202,459	55.8	9,125,866	34.6	34.6	15.7

Here, again, we find that the percentage of increase in yield per acre, both in oats and corn, is greatly in favor of the Southern States as against that of the United States, the actual percentages being 74.3 per cent for the one, against 14.6 per cent for the other. The great State of Illinois, a typical oat-growing State, shows an actual decrease of 16.9 per cent in yield per acre, while in South Carolina, where this crop is of only secondary consideration, there is an increase of 48.7 per cent in yield per acre. What is true of Illinois with respect to oats is also true of Iowa with respect to corn, which shows an increase in yield per acre of only 15.7 per cent, as against an increase of 36.1 per cent for South Carolina. It is true that the production in bushels in oats and corn in Illinois and Iowa is, respectively, much greater than it is in South Carolina, but the thoughtful man must not lose sight of the fact that in the criterion of real progress South Carolina has greatly outstripped both of these States.

But, again, I wish to call the attention of the House to the difference in average and maximum yield in oats for South Carolina, because it is the maximum in everything that inspires progress. The average yield in oats in South Carolina according to the figures is only 18.3 bushels, but in 1882 Col. J. D. Wylie had a yield of 182 bushels from one acre, and last year Mr. E. C. Haynesworth, a most reliable and intelligent gentleman of my district, got a yield of 80 bushels. This does not argue that these great records can ever be made averages, but they do justify the conclusion that under proper methods the average yield may be greatly raised. South Carolina holds the world's record for the greatest yield per acre, 254 bushels and 1 peck, for corn—a record made in 1889 in a world's competitive contest in which nearly every State in the Union participated [applause], and a yield of from 50 to 75 bushels per acre is becoming common among the best farmers of South Carolina. What is true of this State can be said of all the Southern States.

Agricultural scientists agree that the true basis of agriculture is live stock. Can the South raise cattle? The answer is, Can she raise hay, can she grow forage crops? Alfalfa is the main reliance of the Western live-stock industry, but the birthplace of American alfalfa is in Anderson County, S. C., where a plat has been in growth since 1835. So certain is the Department of Agriculture that alfalfa can be grown with great profit and success in the South that great efforts are being made for its general introduction into that section with results gratifying beyond expectation. The gentleman who owns the plat above referred to writes that he "frequently cuts as much as 6,000 pounds per acre in the first and second crops" while an Alabama grower had a net return per acre of \$42 from three cuttings of alfalfa last year, and Doctor Ramseur, of my State, from what the Department of Agriculture terms a "model Southern hay farm," had a yield which

netted him \$60 per acre. But the hay crop of the South is by no means dependent upon the success of the efforts to introduce alfalfa. Her climate and soil make her the natural home of bermuda, the cowpea, and it is our most valuable forage crop, the clovers, and vetches of all kinds, and, in fact, every forage crop which has its habitat in the temperate zones.

These are the natural conditions. Are they not suggestive of a great cattle-growing section? No section of our country can show a more inviting prospect for this great industry. All that is necessary is to have our people go into the business, to lift the quarantine against Southern cattle, and to have the Department of Agriculture continue its great work of teaching the Southern dairyman the best methods, increasing as it had done in the work of the past two years the yield per head of dairy cattle \$3.75 per month, and the cattle industry will take its proper place in the agriculture of the South.

The trite saying among my people is that "he who raises his own hog and hominy not only controls the price of his cotton, but makes himself independent." Can the South raise hogs? The Department of Agriculture says that "the Southern States can produce corn almost as cheaply as the most favored sections of Illinois and Missouri, while the great variety of fruit crops, the more nearly continuous grazing and the consequent greater immunity from disease give special advantages for profitable pork raising which do not exist elsewhere," and the same bulletin declares that the South should lead in pork raising, while enterprising farmers have proven the same thing over and over again.

Mr. Chairman, I have said somewhere in these remarks that the South is or will be the home of the small farmer, the man of average means, of limited capital. I undertake to prove it by two tables showing the comparative possible net returns of an improved farm in South Carolina and one in Iowa, which I submit:

*Value of products of an improved farm in South Carolina.*

[Values figured on prices of December 1, 1907.]

12 acres—12 450-pound bales cotton, 5,400 pounds, at 10 cents	\$540.00
360 bushels cotton seed, at 20 cents	72.00
12 acres—420 bushels corn, at 78 cents per bushel (35 bushels per acre)	327.60
7 acres—280 bushels oats, at 72 cents per bushel (40 bushels per acre)	201.60
5 acres—125 bushels wheat, at \$1.20 per bushel (25 bushels per acre)	150.00
(12 acres following oats and wheat crops, 7 and 5) 12 tons hay, at \$16.50 per ton (1 ton per acre)	198.00
36	1,489.20
Deduct fertilizer	175.00
Balance	1,314.20
Average per acre	35.52
Present income of average South Carolina farm	410.00
Average per acre	11.00

*Value of products of an improved farm in Iowa.*

[Values figured on prices of December 1, 1907.]

80 acres—2,800 bushels corn, at 43 cents per bushel (35 bushels per acre)	\$1,204.00
25 acres—1,000 bushels oats, at 38 cents per bushel (40 bushels per acre)	380.00
10 acres—250 bushels wheat, at 82 cents per bushel (25 bushels per acre)	205.00
15 acres—15 tons hay, at \$8 per ton (1 ton per acre)	120.00
130	1,909.00
Average per acre	14.67
Present income per average farm in Iowa	1,597.00
Average per acre	12.20

The average South Carolina farm of 90 acres, 37 improved, under present methods yields an income of \$410—\$11 per acre—while under improved methods the same acreage will show a money value of \$1,314.20—\$35.52 per acre. The average Iowa farm of 151 acres, 130 improved, gives a value of \$1,597, or \$12.20 per acre, as against an income of \$1,909—\$14.67 per acre—for an improved farm. It is thus seen that 37 acres in South Carolina produce an income of \$1,314, while it takes 130 acres in Iowa to produce \$1,909; or, in other words, the yield per acre in South Carolina is more than two and one-half times that of Iowa, and this means that if the average farm of South Carolina contained an acreage of improved land equal to that of the average Iowa farm the income from it would be \$4,617.60, compared to \$1,909 for Iowa—142 per cent in favor of the South Carolina farm. If we add only 16 acres to the improved land of the average farm of South Carolina we shall have a farm which will bring a profit equal to that of 130 acres, the improved land of the average farm of Iowa. Another point to be considered in this connection is—and it bears out my suggestion that the South offers an unequalled field for the small farmer—that \$1,800 will purchase the average farm, 90 acres, in South Carolina, while the average farm of Iowa—151 acres,



at \$75 per acre—will cost \$11,325, a consideration of vast importance to the investor in farm lands.

And, on an \$1,800 investment the Carolina farm pays an annual dividend of 73 per cent, as against a 17 per cent dividend on the Iowa investment of \$11,325, an actual difference of 56 per cent in favor of the Carolina land. But for fear that we have not done full justice to the productiveness of the Iowa farm we shall quadruple its yield per acre for the various products, making each acre of corn yield 140 bushels; oats, 160; wheat, 100, and hay, 4 tons, and still the per cent of profit for the Iowa farm is 68 per cent as against 73 per cent; while if the same process were applied to South Carolina, the dividend would amount to 292 per cent.

These figures are interesting and valuable not so much as a comparison, but as showing beyond a question, acre for acre under like methods, a capability of productiveness of Southern lands absolutely unapproached by any other section of the country, and in addition to this they show almost boundless opportunities for the farmer of small capital. Two hundred and six million acres classified as unimproved farm lands and millions of acres of unclassified land in the South await the elixir of man's intelligence to lay at his feet their immeasurably rich treasures. [Applause.]

Time does not permit a comprehensive enumeration of the South's enormous possibilities for fruit and truck growing. It is sufficient to say that in the last six years wonderful strides have been made in these lines, and that to the man of care and intelligence they have brought stupendous returns. This industry is in its infancy and is most inviting.

Such, Mr. Chairman, are our possibilities, such are our opportunities, such is the record we have made, and to-day we stand upon the threshold of a great future, the greater triumphs lie before us. Nature has smiled upon this fair land, and the smile has brought joy to the hearts of its people and strength to their arm. The celebrated poet, Emerson, said, "America is another name for opportunity," and that unique character, Greeley, enjoined, "Young man, go West and grow up with the country," but if the great poet and the great philosopher and editor could see the South as she is to-day, with her snowy fields of cotton, her mountains of minerals, her vast forest areas, her rich granite beds, her coal and iron deposits, her fertile plains and unequalled climate, her long seacoast indented with incomparable harbors, her rivers lacing her like ribbons of silver, and her reawakened, confident, and conquering people, the conclusion of the one would be, "The South is another name for opportunity" [applause], and the injunction of the other, "Young man, go South and grow up with the country." [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, we read in Holy Writ of a—

good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills; a land of wheat and barley and vines and fig trees and pomegranates; a land of olive oil and honey; a land wherein thou shalt eat bread without scarceness, thou shalt not lack anything in it; a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass.

And to me it reads like an inspired description of the South fronting the future, confident, buoyant, thrilled by an all-pervading spirit of progress. [Loud applause.]

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REID. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how much time the gentleman from South Carolina has left.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has occupied fifty-six minutes.

Mr. REID. How much time would he have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has four minutes remaining.

Mr. COOK of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, having introduced a bill for the restoration of the duty on manganese iron ore, I will ask the indulgence of the honorable Members of this House for a short time and read the bill. It is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 19365) to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the mining and shipping of manganese iron ore in the United States.

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the 1st day of May, 1908, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all manganese ore imported from foreign countries the sum of 40 cents per gross ton of 2,240 pounds.

The schedule of 40 cents per ton duty was in force on foreign importations of manganese and all other iron ore prior to July, 1897, and was effective for years and is still in effect on all other iron ores, except manganese ore.

At the special session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, after the Senate had passed the bill introduced by Senator BACON, of Georgia, to increase the duty on manganese ore from 40 cents to \$1 per ton for the protection of American producers and American labor, the wage being four times greater paid than the extraordinary cheap pauper labor in Russia, Chile, Bra-

zil, Japan, and Cuba for mining manganese ore, and in addition to this competition a minimum ballast rate from Odessa, Russia, Brazil, Chile, and Cuban ports was and is now being made to New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, which, even before the duty was taken off by the Republican conferees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the competition hereinbefore named made it difficult to compete in the open market with foreign producers.

The conferees from the House of Representatives was composed of the honorables Mr. Dingley, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DALZELL, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. Grosvenor, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. McMillan, and Mr. White of Alabama.

The majority of the conferees of this committee were, then and now, pronounced protectionists; notwithstanding this fact, emphasized, they caused the conferees of the Senate, the honorables Mr. ALLISON, Mr. ALDRICH, Mr. Platt of Connecticut, Mr. BURROWS, Mr. Jones of Arkansas, Mr. Jones of Nevada, Mr. White, and Mr. Vest, to agree in conference to a free duty on manganese ore, effective July, 1897, and since that time almost the entire consumption of manganese ore for making spiegeleisen by the steel mills of the United States—and without the mixture of spiegeleisen steel products of every description can not be made—has been imported free of duty from foreign countries, thereby resulting in great loss to the United States Government, for a duty on 207,068 tons (of 2,240 pounds) of manganese ore received at the different ports of entry in the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, as shown by the statement furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury at my request.

Therefore by placing manganese ore on the free list at the time hereinbefore stated in a great measure totally destroyed the output of mining and shipping manganese ore for steel-making purposes in the following States:

Colorado, Arkansas, California, Georgia, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

The following extracts from the debate in the United States Senate, taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 3, 1897, upon placing manganese ore on the free list, is respectfully submitted:

Mr. BACON. I did not hear the Senator from Iowa with respect to the amendment which he suggested relative to manganese ore.

Mr. ALLISON. It was simply to put on the free list manganese ore not otherwise provided for. There is a duty upon manganese ore.

Mr. BACON. I simply desire to say that according to the best information I can get from those familiar with the subject that is an amendment the practical effect of which is to put all manganese ore on the free list. That is the assurance given to me by those who are interested in it and who have knowledge of all the features of this particular ore. I am quite sure the Senator can get that information if those are appealed to who have the requisite knowledge.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that it is not our purpose to put manganese ore on the free list. I think very likely the amendment as it stands now will have the effect to put most of it on the free list, but I hope that it will be changed later on.

Mr. BACON. I desire to state, in this connection, that I occupy the same position in reference to that particular raw material that I do in reference to all others. I think the putting of raw materials produced in this country, which are to be used by manufacturers, upon the free list is the most odious and unjust form of protection which can be devised. My information is that that will be the effect of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa. I am opposed to protection based upon the protective principle, and I am opposed to free raw materials because I am opposed to protection.

I believe in revenue duties, and I believe in those revenue duties being impartially imposed. I think the question is not one between free trade and tariff duties. I think we are compelled to have a tariff, and that the question is really one which relates to what is a proper tariff and what is an improper tariff, and not a question as between free trade and tariff duties. I think a tariff which puts upon the free list raw material produced in this country is an improper tariff, one in which there is an improper discrimination, one in which the legitimate and necessary effect is protection, I repeat, of the rankest, most offensive, and most unjust form. Ordinary protection is given to the manufacturer at the expense of the great mass of consumers. But free raw materials for the manufacturer is none the less protection, but it is protection to the manufacturer at the expense of the producer of the raw material.

Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa says he anticipates that this may be changed, and consequently what I say now I suggest simply because I will not have an opportunity to be heard before the tribunal by which it is proposed to be changed.

Mr. TELLER. I can see no reason why manganese should be put on the free list any more than iron ore or coal or various other articles. If the committee intend to do that—I have rather understood they did not—they ought to give some reason for it. The Senator says he hopes it will be arranged later. If that means in conference, it is a very unsatisfactory disposition of the case, it seems to me. We have practically no control over it, and while we do not want to be put in a position of making unnecessary delay and contesting all these questions, it seems to me we had better fix it right here. If the committee do not mean to put manganese of all kinds on the free list, let them specify what kind they do want to put on.

Mr. CLAY. I desire to ask the Senator from Iowa how there can be a conference on the question of manganese when the House put it on the free list and it is retained in the free list by the Senate. I do not see how there can be any question in conference. If the bill passes the Senate with manganese on the free list, it looks to me that will be the end of it.

Mr. ALLISON. By an amendment the other day we placed a duty of \$1 a ton upon all manganese ore containing less than 40 metallic units, and then we put manganese ore not specially provided for on the free list, so that the whole question is open for conference.

The Senator from Colorado says, Why not fix it here instead of waiting for the conference? I think myself that the metallic unit should be 50 instead of 40, but I do not know.

Mr. TELLER. I do not.

Mr. ALLISON. I am not supposed to know to a certainty. We did the best we could after consulting the people respecting it. As the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] very well says to me, we have telegraphed for information from other people. We will have the whole matter in conference, to be justly dealt with, as we intend to deal with it. If Senators want to have it disposed of now, they can dispose of it, of course.

Mr. BACON. Manganese is found in a very few localities in the United States. It is in Georgia, Alabama, Virginia, and Arkansas, and possibly there is some in North Carolina.

Mr. TELLER. Colorado.

Mr. BACON. And Colorado also, the Senator from Colorado states. I was not aware of that fact.

As I understand, it is used in the manufacture of all steel. Why there should be any disposition on the part of those who are in charge of the bill in any degree to take from this material that which is so freely and liberally granted in all other directions, I am unable to say or divine.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator from Georgia allow me? Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I was in favor of a duty on manganese ore. The House put it on the free list. The Senate then put \$1 a ton on manganese ore. Then it was represented to the committee that to change it so that manganese ore containing less than 50 metallic units would operate practically to put a duty upon all the ore which really came in competition with American ore. The committee accepted that theory of it and were about to change it in that way. Then we were persuaded to reduce it to 40, and that is the way it stands now.

I think perhaps a mistake has been made. I should like to go back to \$1 a ton on manganese ore, but we are necessarily compelled now to seek accurate information, which we have not at the present time.

Mr. BACON. I trust the Senator will secure it. I have been assured within the past twenty-four hours by a gentleman who professes to know all about this subject, and who is very largely interested, that the practical effect of the proposed amendment is to put it upon the free list.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I am afraid it is.

Mr. BACON. Senators suggest that they have not information to enable them to act upon the matter at this time, and it will have to go before the conference committee, at which time and place, I am sorry to say, I will not be in a position to be heard. Of course we can, as suggested, offer a subsequent amendment.

Mr. CLAY. I understood the Senator from Iowa to say that he is consulting in regard to the matter and expects to change it before the bill passes the Senate, not waiting until it goes into conference. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLISON. I can say that it will be impossible to agree with everything and everybody on this bill before it reaches conference. I did say to the Senator from Georgia that I hoped we might arrange it before the bill finally passed the Senate, and I do, but of course it can not be arranged at this moment; and the amendment I offered a moment ago was to make it absolutely certain that the whole question would go into conference. If Senators wish to dispose of it now or at any time, the bill is open to amendment, and they can propose any amendment they choose. The committee is trying to do the best it can about the matter, and will endeavor to treat it fairly. That is all I have to say.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me to make a suggestion in furtherance of the desire expressed by himself? If this amendment is not put upon the committee amendment previously adopted, the whole matter will go into conference, because as it came from the House manganese was on the free list. If the Senate puts it on the taxed list, of course the whole subject is open for the action of the conference. But, on the contrary, if the Senate, by the present amendment, puts it back on the free list, will the subject be any further open to conference between the two Houses? If I am in order, I will make the motion. I have not the paragraph before me, and I can not tell exactly what the phraseology should be.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is on page 175.

Mr. BACON. I will move that the paragraph be so amended as to put manganese ore on the tax list at a dollar a ton.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is an amendment pending, the amendment of the committee, on page 169, paragraph 505. Will the Senator from Iowa permit that to be withdrawn temporarily, that the motion of the Senator from Georgia may be entertained?

Mr. QUAY. I hope the amendment of the Senator from Iowa will not be withdrawn. The manganese ore is ore which enters into the manufacture of iron and steel, and in the use of which and duty upon which every producer of iron and steel in this country is interested. The manganese of the grade necessary to produce the higher grades of iron and steel is not found in this country except in very small quantities.

I believe there is manganese in Georgia; there is manganese in Arkansas; there is manganese in Virginia, and there is a large quantity of manganese in Colorado, it is said, but it is of low grade. The Colorado manganese is in the form of manganiferous ore, containing, I think, only 23 per cent of manganese.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. QUAY. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. We have been shipping quite large quantities from Colorado to the Illinois Steel Company.

Mr. QUAY. I understand that last year Colorado shipped 13,000 tons to the Illinois Steel Company of this low-grade manganese ore, which is called "manganiferous ore," and the duty upon it is provided, as the Senator from Colorado will find, in paragraph 118, in connection with iron ore. It is used in the manufacture of steel rails. The first product procured from it is not ferromanganese, the product of the higher grade of manganese ore, but spiegeleisen, out of which steel rails are made. The effect simply of the imposition of a duty upon this manganese would be to impose a revenue duty to that extent upon all of the manganese imported from abroad. It would not, I think, benefit the Senator from Georgia, and certainly not the Senator from Colorado, a cent. If the duty is to be imposed upon the raw material, of course it follows that the duty must go upon ferromanganese, which is the product.

I have a paper here upon manganese. I have not devoted much attention to this subject, but I have just been glancing over the paper handed to me giving the statistics of the manganese ore, which I send to the desk to have read. I trust the amendment offered on behalf of the committee will be adopted.

Mr. BACON. Upon the assurance given by Senators that they consider that this amendment does not cut off any part of the consideration by the conference committee, but that the whole subject will be open, I am willing to withdraw the amendment, because at last it is to rest with the conference committee.

Mr. QUAY. I should be glad to have the paper which I sent to the desk read or go into the RECORD anyhow. I want it to go before the conference committee. As a matter of course, the entire subject will be before the conference committee, and I hope the conferees will adhere to the determination of the Senate.

Mr. BACON. I will simply state in this connection, as we will not have an opportunity to be heard before the conferees, that the freight upon manganese ore from the point of mining to the mills where the steel is made exceeds the cost of water transportation on similar ore of either a higher or lower grade brought from other countries to the mills for the same purpose. There is a very large amount of it, I understand, in Central America close to water transportation. Upon the assurance that the Senate conferees will have the entire subject-matter open and that the amendment proposed by the committee will not cut off any part of it, I will withdraw the amendment which I offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURROWS in the chair). The Chair understands that the Senator from Georgia withdraws his amendment.

Mr. QUAY. Let the paper I sent to the desk be read. I prefer to put it in the RECORD in that form.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let it be printed without being read.

Mr. QUAY. I will agree that it shall be printed without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the paper will be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The paper referred to is as follows:

#### MANGANESE ORES.

Manganese ore bears the same relation to the metal manganese as iron ore does to the metal iron, or lead ore to lead, and in commerce runs from 45 to 55 per cent manganese, and must be low enough in phosphorus to make a metal that shall not contain on an average twenty-five one-hundredths of 1 per cent phosphorus. All manganese ores contain more or less of iron.

Manganiferous ore is an iron ore containing from 3 to 20 per cent of manganese. The higher grade is foreign and supply limited. Colorado is producing some 28 per cent manganese ore. The prominent supply in this country is from the Lake Superior region, and contains from 3 to 8 per cent of manganese.

#### USES.

Manganese ore is used to make ferromanganese, which contains—

	Per cent.
Manganese.....	80
Iron.....	12
Carbon.....	8
Total.....	100

Manganiferous ores are used to make spiegeleisen, which is ordinarily of two grades—one containing 10 per cent manganese, the other 20 per cent manganese, the remaining percentage being iron with carbon, etc. About twenty-five one-hundredths of a ton of manganese ores is used with the manganiferous ores to produce a ton of spiegeleisen to get the proper grade.

Ferromanganese (metal) is used in the manufacture of steel, principally in low-carbon steel. The manganese is to remove the oxide of iron in melted steel, and the carbon to add the percentage necessary.

Spiegeleisen (metal) is used for high-carbon steel, like steel rails, permitting of adding more carbon without increasing the manganese.

#### SUPPLY OF MANGANESE ORES.

About 9 per cent of the supply was imported in 1894 and 1895 and 95 per cent will be imported in 1897.

The importations are as follows:

Year.	Gross tons.	Value.
1894.....	71,400	\$534,000
1895.....	66,600	545,000
1896.....	60,000	567,487
1897 (estimated).....	120,000	1,250,000

The home production has been as follows:

Year.	Gross tons.	Value.
1894.....	6,308	\$53,635
1895.....	9,547	71,769
1896.....	7,000	50,000
1897.....	(*)	(*)

\* Will not exceed 1896.

Distribution, by States.

State.	1894.	1895.
	Tons.	Tons.
Arkansas.....	1,934	2,991
California.....	278	525
Georgia.....	1,277	3,858
Tennessee.....	922	
Pennsylvania.....		460
Virginia.....	1,797	1,715
West Virginia.....	100	
Total.....	6,308	9,547

In 1893 the production was 7,718 tons.



## SEARCH FOR MANGANESE ORES.

The manufacturers of steel in this country have searched in every State for manganese ore, and since the Crimora mine in Virginia closed in 1892, no other deposit of any size of merchantable ore has been found. Large sums of money are being spent annually in such search, and, as an extra inducement to development, a higher price is offered and paid for domestic ores than for the foreign ores. In this country the deposits are all in pockets of small and uncertain size, particularly in Arkansas and Virginia. The former ore is too high in phosphorous to work alone, and low phosphorous ores must be imported to mix with it. Likewise the bulk of the Virginia deposits are useless on account of containing too much phosphorous.

## COLORADO.

It has been stated that Colorado could produce almost sufficient manganese ore to supply this country. This is erroneous, as Colorado produces no manganese ore, or practically none, the product being a manganiferous iron ore containing 22 to 28 per cent manganese, and is used in the manufacture of spiegeleisen containing 20 per cent manganese, and principally at the works of the Illinois Steel Company, for which purpose they are using it at the present time. Colorado produced 13,464 tons of such ore in 1896, which would make about 18,000 tons of spiegel, while the requirement for spiegel in 1896 was about 85,000 tons, and this is outside of the use of ferromanganese, which requires high-grade imported manganese ores, containing 45 to 55 per cent manganese.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican party in its national platform for the past forty-five years has proclaimed the doctrine of the protective-tariff principle for American labor and capital against the pauper labor and cunning capital of foreign monarchy.

From the great Morrill tariff bill to the Dingley bill, in a measure, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States have protected the American miner, laborer, and manufacturer of raw material of iron ore, steel, coal, coke, gold, copper, lead, zinc, lumber, and a thousand other things originally produced in the United States.

Why Congress should discriminate against manganese ore that must be used in the manufacture of steel rails and all other steel structural formations and put it on the free list is a glaring inconsistency and smacks strongly of special legislation for special manufacturers.

If iron ore is favored by a high protective tax and 35,000,000 tons were mined and shipped in the United States during the year of 1907 to exclude foreign competition, it is certainly reasonable that 40 cents or even \$1 per ton as a duty passed by the Senate should be placed on the peculiar metal, manganese, that is absolutely necessary to make a durable and perfect steel rail, as well as all other manufactured steel products, owing to the fact that manganese gives iron a greater tensile strength, elasticity, and elongation.

Mr. Chairman, when wealthy American manufacturers import free pauper labor and free cheap ore they are indirectly cutting their own throats at the temporary saving of a few dollars and heaping hot coals on the heads of intelligent American miners, not only in Colorado but in many other States of the Union.

Before manganese ore was placed on the free list by the conferees of the House I was the largest shipper of manganese ore in the United States; have shipped from Leadville, Colo., more than 125,000 tons of manganese ore for steel manufacturing purposes, mined by American labor, the wage paid being \$3 per day for miners and \$4 per day for engineers and pump men, precisely the same wage as paid by mine operators in Colorado for mining gold, silver, lead, and copper bearing ores, in competition with a wage of 60 to 75 cents per day paid for mining manganese ore in Russia, Chile, Brazil, Japan, and Cuba, to the absolute injury of intelligent American labor. From these countries the supply is now coming in ballast to the United States and used by all of the steel mills in our country, except the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company, of Pueblo, Colo. (the only steel works west of Chicago), and since the establishment of the Colorado Steel Works in 1880 (twenty-eight years) have used more than 500,000 tons of Leadville manganese ore for making spiegeleisen, the mixture with pig iron, for reasons hereinbefore stated, mixed in converting furnaces producing steel ingots from which merchantable steel is rolled into shape.

Mr. Chairman, millions of tons of iron (hematite) ore in the Mesaba, Gogebec, and Menominee ranges of Michigan and Minnesota are mined in open cuts with steam shovels, and placed on cars at cost of 26½ cents per ton; this ore is protected by duty, as it should be.

The average cost for mining manganese ore and putting on cars at Leadville, Colo., is \$2.77 per ton, and mined at depths of 300 to 640 feet from surface, and through verticle shafts, with long distance underground for miners to push tram cars to the station level.

The cost of mining and washing manganese ore in the States of Virginia, West Virginia, Tennessee, Georgia, and Arkansas has been \$5 per ton, owing to the washing process required to make the ore marketable.

I take from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 3, 1897, the debate for placing manganese ore on the free list:

Mr. QUAY. There is manganese in Georgia, there is manganese in Arkansas, there is manganese in Virginia, and there is a large quantity of manganese in Colorado, it is said, but it is of low grade.

The Colorado manganese is in the form of manganiferous ore, containing, I think, only 23 per cent of manganese.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. QUAY. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. We have been shipping large quantities of manganese ore from Colorado to the Illinois Steel Company, Chicago.

Mr. QUAY. I understand that last year Colorado shipped 13,000 tons to the Illinois Steel Company of this low-grade manganese ore, which is called manganiferous ore, and the duty upon it is provided as the Senator from Colorado will find in paragraph 118 in connection with iron ore.

It so happened, Mr. Chairman, I was the shipper of the 13,000 tons of manganese ore to the Illinois Steel Company, Chicago, from Leadville.

I regret Senator Quay was given incorrect information as to the per cent of manganese "being 23 per cent," while in fact the per cent was 30 manganese and 18 per cent of iron in combination, and the contract price, based on these figures and settlements paid for accordingly and shipped and paid for as manganese ore, per contract.

Now, Mr. Chairman, any practical chemist or metallurgist in the United States will say manganese does not exist in its pure state in any part of the world, where deposits are known to exist, but metallic iron is found invariably in combination with the manganese, which is manganiferous iron ore, the 207,068 tons of manganiferous iron ore that was received for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, at the following customs districts, as furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury:

	Tons.	Value.
Baltimore.....	111,546	\$766,512
Boston and Charlestown.....	2	73
Newark, N. J.....	117	1,322
New York.....	7,349	149,933
Philade'phia.....	87,068	730,625
New Orleans.....	475	4,043
San Francisco.....	53	2,424
Chicago.....	355	15,473
Cincinnati.....	73	2,229
Total.....	207,068	1,672,634

Should have paid a duty to the Government of 40 cents per ton, or the sum of \$82,800 for the year, for the good and sufficient reason each and every ton of this foreign ore was manganiferous iron ore, but a Department ruling by the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, W. B. Howell, delegated within himself the powers only granted under the law to the Congress of the United States, the Treasury Department has, and still maintains, this manifestly unfair ruling, resulting in great loss of revenue to the Government, as hereinbefore stated.

March 1, 2, 3, 1898, I personally appealed to the Board of General Appraisers, New York, furnishing Col. George C. Tichenor, president of the Board, with analysis of foreign "manganese" ore from samples of ore taken while unloading cargoes at the ports of New York and Baltimore, showing conclusively the ore was manganiferous, containing manganese and iron in combination. After making this showing of facts to President Tichenor on March 4, 1898, he recommended to Assistant Secretary W. B. Howell, of the Treasury, instructions be given collectors of customs to assess the duty at 40 cents per ton, prescribed in schedule "C" on all ore containing metallic iron and manganese in combination without regard to the percentage or invoice designation, whether as iron-ore manganese, manganiferous, or oxide of manganese or otherwise.

On March 10, 1898, after several personal interviews in this city with officials of the Treasury Department, I wrote Hon. W. B. Howell, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, as follows:

I beg to call your attention to my conversation of Tuesday last, and referring to letter to you from Senator Wolcott, under date March 2, your reply, dated March 5, as follows:

"I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 2d instant, in which you request to be advised as to the Department's definition of the term 'manganese ore,' the Department decided that manganiferous ores, to be entitled to free entry as manganese ore under the provision therefor in the free list of the tariff act then in force, must contain 50 per cent or over of manganese in quantity and not over 10 per cent of iron.

"This rule was laid down for the general guidance of custom officers, but in some cases, when the percentage of manganese was slightly less than 50 per cent, say, from 40 to 44 per cent, importations were admitted free as manganese ore when valuable only for the manganese contained therein.

"W. B. HOWELL,  
Assistant Secretary."

As the producers of manganese ore in the States of Colorado, Georgia, Arkansas, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia, we under-

stand the free list is only to apply on straight manganese ore (if obtainable) or, to be explicit, manganese ore carrying no metallic iron. These two metals in combination, being manganiferous iron ore, therefore should pay duty of 40 cents per ton, etc.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is quite noticeable the Treasury Department changed their ruling to admit the ore free of duty as the character of ore changed in per cent of metallic contents. The facts are, of the 207,068 tons arriving for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, over 190,000 tons analyzed much less than 50 per cent manganese, and each and every ton carried metallic iron in combination, or, to be specific, manganiferous iron ore, by departmental ruling, in violation of the law, has passed free of duty for nearly eleven years; an unusual usurpation of pretended authority and manifestly unfair discrimination against (at that time) a growing industry in the States named.

The result, Mr. Chairman, has been to destroy almost entirely the mining and shipping of manganese (manganiferous iron ore) in the United States.

Representatives of certain interests will tell you there is no manganese (manganiferous) ore in the United States. Leadville, Colo., has since 1879—twenty-nine years—mined and shipped over 2,400,000 tons. Of this enormous tonnage 670,000 tons were shipped to the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company Steel Works, Pueblo, Colo., and the Illinois Steel Company, Chicago, for steel manufactured products; the remaining 1,730,000 tons to the Colorado Smelters for the fluxing and separation of silver, lead, gold, and other valuable ores, a charge of 30 per cent of iron being required for each and every mixture charge in the blast furnaces at these smelters.

I quote these figures of output of Colorado manganese ore to show the great injustice done by the governmental Bureau of Statistics, and quote from their figures, as given in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 3, 1897, the tonnage of manganese ore produced in the years of 1893, 1894, and 1895, in the States of Arkansas, California, Georgia, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia, a total of 23,573 tons, while the tonnage of manganese ore produced in Colorado is left out entirely, which amounted to the large tonnage of 219,445 tons for the years 1893, 1894, and 1895.

The Bureau of Statistics figures, absolutely unreliable, was done for the specific purpose of misleading unknown Members of the Fifty-fifth Congress, or part of the programme of the secret alliance formed in the House and Senate, through misrepresentations or misapprehension. There was but little manganese ore in the United States; therefore the scheme to place manganese ore on the free list was by unfair methods accomplished, which has resulted in a loss of revenue to the Government since 1897 of nearly \$1,000,000.

The conferees of the House, in their great haste to place manganese ore (which, as hereinbefore stated, does not exist except in name), through their inexperience as practical chemists, metallurgists, or manufacturers of steel products, should have been requested and also had stipulated "manganiferous iron ore" (manganese and metallic iron in combination) be placed on the free list, and the alliance would then have accomplished the purpose they originally started out to do. Notwithstanding the daily pledge then and now made by the majority of the conferees of the House of Representatives, they at all times stood for the protection of American industries and American labor.

In the presentation of these indisputable facts of the great injustice by the conferees of the House of the Fifty-fifth Congress, your favorable consideration and cooperation is earnestly requested to restore the duty on manganese ore, thereby carrying out the protective principles and pledges of the Republican party, in the interests of American capital and labor. [Loud applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I will send to the desk and ask that the Clerk read a resolution, and at a later date I will ask that the matter be heard before this House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Cook] offers a resolution, which the Clerk will read in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, requested to send to the House of Representatives full information by what authority of law 207,068 tons of "manganese" ore (or manganiferous iron ore) were admitted free of duty at the ports of entry, New York, Baltimore, Boston, Newark, N. J., Philadelphia, New Orleans, San Francisco, Chicago, and Cincinnati for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907.

Mr. REID. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Arkansas rise?

Mr. REID. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] reserved the balance of his time, which was four minutes, and yielded that much time to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. REID. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the remarks of the able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture relating to the extension of the forest surveys of the country, and I had intended to discuss that subject at some little length if I could secure the time, but, not being able to do so, I now ask the unanimous consent of the committee, at the expiration of the time allotted to me, to extend my remarks upon the subject in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. REID] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID. Mr. Chairman, in the last few months, by the proclamation of the President, there has been withdrawn from the public domain in the State of Arkansas something like 2,000,000 acres of land, which have been set apart as forest reserves. This, it will be noticed, is an area almost as great as the combined acreage of the two States of Rhode Island and Delaware. It is two-thirds as large as Connecticut and nearly half as large as New Jersey. It brings the aggregate area of the national forest reserves up to the dignity of a territorial domain greater than all New England and the State of New York combined. Parallel with the expanding area of the national forest reserves is also the steadily increasing importance of the Forestry Service and the broadening application of the policies they have inaugurated. From the proposition to set aside a few areas on account of the peculiar conditions that existed we have advanced to an entirely new policy with reference to the public domain, at least so far as the country is concerned. In many respects it is an extreme departure from the idea that we have for long years entertained in regard to the power and purposes of the Federal Government in the disposition of the public lands.

I deem it, Mr. Chairman, as highly important that we should examine carefully the scope and purpose of this new movement and test it by the principle which constitutes the framework of our Government before proceeding so far that mistakes can not be remedied. Arguments that our forests may be made a source of great revenue are alluring, but ours is not a monarchical government. Our domain is not held as a source of profit to the State, but that it might become homes for the American people and that every citizen might select where he pleased. Arguments that it is not intended to interfere with the homesteader may tend to popularize the movement, but a careful examination will disclose that the services can not be properly administered and its avowed purposes accomplished consistent with a liberal construction of the homestead law. The establishment of the homestead law within the reserve must be consistent with the purposes of the reserve. We had as well meet the matter fairly. If we establish the policy we must recognize it as a long step toward eradication of the homestead laws. If this is to be done, and surely something must be done to conserve the timber resources of the country and in the interest of navigation, what are the rights of the States to whose taxable values these lands would otherwise have added? No well-informed man will deny that to the operation of the homestead laws, perhaps more than any other one thing, is due the wonderful development and progress of the West.

When the act of March 3, 1901, was passed vesting in the President the power to make these reservations, no general notice was taken of the fact in the State of Arkansas, for the reason that until then but a few people were aware that enough public lands of the required character were lying contiguous in the State to constitute a reserve of any consequence. Still fewer conceived the idea that the public good required the segregation of the lands for such a purpose. When the proclamation of the President attracted general attention to the fact, most people were inclined to look with apprehension upon the movement. The fact is well known to the people of that State that a large per cent of the lands embraced in these reserves are susceptible of a high state of cultivation in the ordinary crops of the country, and a still larger per cent would maintain orchards and vineyards of the highest order. In short, the fact is that most of these lands can be made homes for the people. They are high and healthy and with an abundance of pure water and other conditions that invite settlement and development. The State, in advertising her resources and inviting immigration from overcrowded sections of the country, has pointed to her vast public domain as available for homestead entry and development. We have looked forward to the time when these lands should become the subject of private ownership and go upon the tax books of the counties in which they lie and contribute their share toward bearing the public burdens and maintaining the school systems of the State.



It is not denied that the public domain should be administered in the interest of all the people, but the policy established by the homestead law under which the people of the immediate locality and the State in which the lands lie are made to realize the immediate, and the general public the indirect but not less substantial, benefit is so deeply embedded in the minds of the people of the States where the conditions exist that they are extremely slow to realize that a great benefit may be secured to them and their children by the appropriation of these lands to a different purpose. I confess that I have reached the conclusion that the establishment of these reserves in my State is to the public good only after a careful examination into the whole question and in spite of preconceived ideas to the contrary. To one who will give the question the thought it deserves it will be made to appear that there are overwhelming reasons why these forests should be intelligently conserved. Not only is it essential to the perpetuation of an abundant supply of lumber and wood, among the chief factors of human progress, but their effect upon climatic condition is equally important. Beyond this is the still more important fact that the destruction of the forests upon the mountain slopes leaves the soil unprotected, and the rains, which should add to the productiveness of the earth and preserve the equal flow of the water, unrestrained by the sponge-like character of the forests and the fallen leaves, become a destructive agency by which the fertile surface soil is carried suddenly into the stream below, filling up the channel, obstructing navigation, and forcing the stream from its banks to inundate the surrounding country, only to be followed by extreme scarcity of water in the earth and in the streams as the season when it is most needed advances.

That the control and navigability of the inland streams as well as the question of overflow of the lowlands are interdependent upon the proper management of the forests on the headwaters is no longer open to controversy. These are not speculations, but are based upon clearest scientific principles. So generally have these facts come to be recognized and so important are they considered to the general welfare that the President, in his message to Congress December 3, 1907, recommended that—

We should acquire in the Appalachian and White Mountain regions all the forest lands that it is possible to acquire for the use of the nation. These lands, because they form a national asset, are as emphatically national as the rivers they feed and which flow through so many States before they reach the ocean.

Bills have been introduced looking to the acquirement of title to lands situated on the watersheds of navigable streams in the Southern Appalachian Mountains within the States of Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, and Tennessee and the White Mountains within the States of New Hampshire and Maine. In March, 1907, in the agricultural appropriation bill, Congress directed the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate these watersheds and report to Congress, among other things, as to the advisability of setting apart these regions as a national forest reserve for the purpose of conserving and regulating the water supply and flow of the streams in the interest of agriculture, water power, and navigation. Investigation by competent experts has disclosed that the country consumes every year more than three times as much wood as is being grown in the same length of time, and the commercial supply, it is estimated, will be exhausted in less than thirty years.

Recent reports from the Forestry Service show that decisive action must be taken at once to avoid the destruction of the manufacturing interests which depend upon a permanent supply of wood. These manufactures embrace the makers of lumber and building materials, the manufacturers of agricultural implements, vehicle makers, cooperage interests, and furniture factories. Last year the cotton-milling industry of the South and East and the different factories throughout the country suffered more than a hundred millions, due to floods traceable to the destruction of the forests. This does not include the value of crops and other farm property destroyed in the lowlands, involving the caving of banks and destruction of levees. These are but a few of the reasons that have given rise to the sentiment which is national in its scope demanding the creation of forest reserves in all parts of the country. Another thing that should be mentioned in this connection is the fact that the establishment of these reserves will operate to prevent the speculation in timber so widely carried on under the guise of homestead entries, and at the same time, if the forest-awowed policy is carried out in good faith, such lands as are really best suited to agricultural purposes may still be made available for homes for the people.

These reasons, it seem to me, are entirely sufficient to overcome every objection to the movement, even though we entirely disregard the sad experiences of other nations in permitting the

entire destruction of their forests. We learn from information collected by the Forest Service that silviculture was a subject of interest more than 2,000 years ago. The pathway of civilization has been hewn through the forests. They are first encountered as obstacles and their superabundance regarded as a hindrance to progress and development. As their borders were gradually driven back by waste and destruction, the question of wood supply and building material forced itself forward along with the discovery of the fact that the forest was the controlling factor in the flow of the streams and the fertility of the soil. Nations that had permitted the wanton destruction of their forests set about the slow and expensive process of reforestation. Out of the dire necessity of the situation came the recognition of the fact that the forests are essential and should be regarded like any other crop—fit for the harvest only when ripe, and so managed as to be made to grow again. China and Turkey are the only remaining civilized nations to-day that do not practice forestry. It has been suggested that the standard of the civilization of a nation may be determined by its recognition of the value of its forests. The costly experience of France alone in suffering the deforestation of her mountain sides and watershed should be sufficient to warn all other countries. From the history of this movement compiled by the Forestry Service, we learn that more than three hundred years ago the influence of the forests upon the dangerous torrents of the Alps and the Pyrenees was recognized, and restrictions were prescribed against clearing the mountain sides, and their violation punished by fines, confiscation, and corporal punishment.

These restrictions were effective for a time, but they were swept away by the French Revolution, to be followed by the almost immediate result that the brooks were converted into torrents that swept down the mountain sides unchecked, overflowing the valleys and covering them with sterile soil until 800,000 acres of farm lands were practically destroyed. The inhabitants of eighteen Departments were driven in poverty from their homes. Toward the close of the eighteenth century conditions had grown so alarming that a reaction began, and with the nineteenth century came the movement to repair the damage done by the costly mistake. After several unsuccessful attempts recourse was had to reforestation. One and a half million acres have been acquired, and before the work has been completed over \$50,000,000 will have been spent in the work. The changing of the sand dunes on the coast into forests of valuable wood and the transformation of 2,000,000 acres of sands and marshes into a forest worth \$100,000,000 are some of the practicable results that have been accomplished. Lands in France which could be bought for \$4 an acre before reforestation began are now yielding a net annual revenue of \$3 per acre. Thus it is shown that forestry in France has not only removed the danger from floods and sand dunes, but has added many millions to the national wealth, and a net annual revenue of over \$4,700,000. A glance at the statistics compiled upon this subject by Mr. Cleveland, of the Forestry Service, will show that the United States has not exercised its usual spirit of enterprise and progress upon this subject.

France took steps in this direction over three hundred years ago. The first ordinance of Bern for the regulation of forests in Switzerland was issued six hundred years ago, and the Shilwald of Zurich, intelligently managed since 1800, yields an average net annual profit of \$12 per acre. Sweden awoke in 1638 to the fact that her marvelous forests could be destroyed by waste and neglect, and appointed her overseers of forest to conserve the supply. Denmark stopped the destruction of her forests in 1805 and began a management along careful and profitable lines. Russia, profiting by the experience of Germany and France, began the conservation of her forests two hundred and fifty years ago. Protective measures were commenced in India at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and Japan enjoys the distinction and profit of having practiced forestry before the dawn of the Christian era. Italy and China furnished impressive examples of what it costs a nation to suffer the destruction of her forests. These facts not only admonish us in no uncertain tones that the conservation of our forests must be undertaken at once, but that we have suffered much by waiting so long to commence. The most important fact, however, to which I desire now to call your attention, is that these natural forests, where scientifically managed, are made to yield a revenue of considerable proportions.

France and Germany combined have a forest area of only 14,500,000 acres, and yet reap an annual net revenue of \$30,000,000. The total net revenue from the state forest of Austria is more than \$5,000,000. From three and one-half millions of acres in Hungary an annual net revenue of \$600,000 is derived. Sweden from the same source nets two million per annum, and Russia from her 660,000,000 acres realizes \$21,-

500,000; India, \$3,300,000; Japan, \$8,000,000. The Forestry Service has compiled a table showing the amount of expenditure per acre upon the national forests of the countries where they are maintained and the net revenue derived therefrom. With the exception of the United States it is as follows:

Country.	Expenditure per acre.	Net revenue per acre.
Württemberg.....	\$2.05	\$6.60
Saxony.....	3.00	5.30
Baden.....	3.58	4.42
Hesse.....	1.25	4.29
Switzerland.....	1.32	2.55
Prussia.....	1.58	2.50
Bavaria.....	1.99	2.22
France.....	.95	1.75
Italy.....		.33
Hungary.....	.34	.32
Austria.....	.56	.21
Roumania.....		.18
Spain.....		.17
Sweden.....	.02	.09
Russia.....	.01	.032

From these figures the significant fact appears that the greatest net revenues are produced where the greatest expenditures have been made. The United States, with an expenditure of \$0.007 per acre for the year 1905-6, sustained a deficit of \$12,000, and with an expenditure of \$0.093 for 1906-7 realized a revenue of \$128,659. Now, it is apparent that unless there is some obstacle to successful forestry in the United States that is not encountered elsewhere our forests will in time become a source of enormous and permanent revenue. So far from there being any such obstacle, we are told by those to whom the investigation of the question has been committed that we have at the very start every assurance of success. Many of the conditions which have made expensive and burdensome the establishment and maintenance of national forests elsewhere do not exist here. There are no forests in the world that exceed ours in the value and variety of the woods. We have every facility for developing them to the highest state of perfection and transporting the products to the most profitable markets. Therefore we have every reason to believe that what has been accomplished elsewhere in this respect we can even improve on here. The average net revenue of the nations given in the table above will be found to be something more than \$2 per acre. I think no one will dispute that the conditions for successful forestry in this country are at least a third better than the average in other countries. We have now embraced within the forest reserves of this country 164,963,555 acres. If these possibilities can be attained, if we can do in this country what has been done in others under difficulties we do not encounter, then we could derive from these forests the enormous net annual revenue of \$494,890,665.

Nearly six millions per annum could be realized from these forests in Arkansas alone. Of course these figures are large and invite the usual discredit with which new and advanced ideas are always assailed, but no good reason can be given why the American people can not accomplish here what has been done by the less ingenious and enterprising under less favorable circumstances elsewhere. To say the least of it, these forests properly managed not only protect the flow of the streams and the water supply in the earth, which is essential to our well-being as a nation, but they will certainly become a source of revenue of considerable consequences. Scientific forestry in this country is of such recent origin that the question of the proper and equitable disbursement of these revenues has not yet arisen, but the fact that a net return of \$128,000 in the year 1907 is shown, as against a deficit of \$12,000 in 1906 upon an increased expenditure of only \$0.086, shows how soon this question will arise. In anticipation of it, various suggestions have been made as to what purpose these proceeds should be applied to. It is contended by some that they should be applied to the acquisition of lands for reforestation upon the headwaters of navigable streams where the mountain sides have been stripped of their timber and where no Government land exists. If this suggestion should be adopted, it could not, in the nature of the case, be regarded as a permanent policy.

The Forestry Service has not, so far as I am informed, made an official recommendation upon the subject, but I have reason to believe that they would advise the appropriation of the proceeds for the present to the improvement of existing reservations and the establishment of schools of forestry and instructions in the development and operation of water-power plants and the control and measurement of streams. In so far as this may be necessary to an effective inauguration of the system

and the education of the people up to a proper appreciation of the possibilities that may be attained by scientific forestry, I am not prepared to say that the idea should not be carried out. But there is an important and fundamental limitation upon these suggestions which I think should be carefully guarded in the very beginning, and which I, for one, will never surrender without resisting with all the earnestness of which I am capable, and that is the equity which the localities, the States themselves, have to the public domain within their borders. As I stated in the beginning, the settled policy of the Government long since established is to convey the lands to settlers for homes and thereby add them to the taxable values of the States. I think no one will contend in the face of various adjudications upon the subject that the Federal Government could acquire lands in the first instance for the purpose of engaging in forestry.

Such a purpose does not come within any of the powers conferred by the Constitution. It is only where the acquisition is necessary to some governmental use and authorized by the Constitution that the Federal Government may own and hold such property. It was never intended that the Federal Government should hold the public domain as a means of engaging in enterprises, or even for the purpose of fostering and protecting agriculture or water power. These are matters which pertain to the power of the States. In the case of *Van Brocklin v. Tennessee* the Supreme Court said that "the United States do not and can not hold property as a monarch may for private and personal purposes." The property of the United States, like its revenues, must be applied to the payment of its debts and to provide for the common defense and general welfare. If the United States has power to acquire the lands proposed to be set apart as the Appalachian and White Mountain forest reserves it is because of the fact that the maintenance of forests upon these lands are necessary to the proper control of the water flow into navigable streams, over which the Federal Government has jurisdiction by virtue of the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution. The power to acquire the lands for the purpose of protecting the navigability of an interstate stream may find ample warrant in the Constitution of the United States, but if it was proposed to acquire these lands simply for the purpose of improving the forests and conserving the timber supply or developing water power, independent of its necessity for interstate commerce, no one will contend that authority for such an undertaking could be found in the Federal Constitution.

In other words, the acquisition and ownership of lands by the Federal Government must be for the purpose of exercising or carrying out some governmental power or function which is found in the Constitution. This being true as to the lands acquired by the United States, I maintain that the public domain undisposed of should be administered in view of the same governmental power and purposes. The Constitution provides that "Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations, respecting the territory or other property of the United States." In this may be found authority for the establishment of forest reserves upon the public lands, but if it is to become a permanent policy and vast revenues in excess of the costs of the administration is to be derived therefrom, the question may well be asked, How should these revenues be applied and disbursed? We are told by scientific authority that the forests should be regarded as any other crop, to harvest when ripe and to be handled so as to be made to produce again. This is the business in which it is proposed we shall engage here. It is shown that intelligent silviculture is a highly profitable enterprise. In the old country millions of acres are owned by private individuals and maintained for the purpose of growing wood and timber for market. Now, if the Federal Government can reserve the public domain for the purpose of growing timber for market, why, upon the same principle, could it not fell the timber, clear it up, and rent it out to individuals if such a course was found to be profitable? Why could it not build houses and tenements upon it and farm it upon shares or collect rents?

None will contend that the appropriation of the public domain to such purpose would be within the constitutional powers of the Federal Government. Now, the potent influence of the forests upon the navigable streams furnishes the authority for reserving the lands and perpetuating the forests, but after this has been accomplished what is to become of the net revenue which a proper management of the forests will insure? If the lands are not reserved from entry they gradually become the subject of private ownership, find their way to the tax books and are added to the property of the State in which they lie. I insist that after they have served the Governmental purpose of controlling the flow upon the watersheds of the navigable streams the surplus proceeds equitably should go exactly where



the lands would have gone had the reserve not been established. The Supreme Court has said that the power to regulate commerce extends to the control of navigable rivers to the extent of the right to remove dams or obstructions upon the headwaters that diminish or impair navigability. If the destruction of the forests diminish the navigability of the streams, Congress may well make the reservation, but the management of the forests to conserve the timber supply or to develop the water powers within a State should be properly accomplished through the agency of the State government. In the case of *Fort Leavenworth v. Lowe* the Supreme Court said that the State and the General Government may deal with each other in any way they deem best to carry out the purposes of the Constitution.

Be this as it may one thing is certain, the Federal Government may or may not have the constitutional power to administer the public forests for the purpose of creating a revenue and appropriating that revenue as it pleases, but in either event good faith upon the part of the Government demands that the States should have the benefit of those funds for educational purposes after the costs of administration shall have been met. The 10 per cent which is to be paid into the State treasury under existing law for schools and roads recognizes the principle, but does not go far enough. The Federal Government should have the 10 per cent and the 90 should go to the schools and roads of the State. In my judgment we should early announce the policy of committing these funds sacredly to this purpose. Let it be upon condition that the funds be supplemented by a like sum from the State if you will, but make it in some way available for the schools and roads of the State, two subjects which, when rightly received, are closely akin. Due to the good works of the Agricultural Department an earnest demand has been created for the establishment of schools where agriculture, mechanics, and home economics may be taught, and the youth of the community be afforded the foundation for an industrial education. Some of the States have led out in this direction, notably Ohio, Alabama, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Nebraska, and the Dakotas. They have achieved most excellent results and have deserved, and in some instances received, recognition at the hands of the Federal Government.

I know that the objection usually urged against legislation of this character is that its general tendency is to obliterate the lines of demarcation between the States and Federal Government. I am opposed to paternalism, and shall resist every invasion of the rights of the States to regulate and control their internal and domestic affairs. I shall maintain, however, that this principle does not contravene the right of the State to demand and receive at the hands of the Federal Government the financial assistance which its enormous powers of raising revenue enables it to afford, or to furnish help through its administrative agencies, for which it is so amply equipped. There is no Member of the House more jealous of preserving the integrity of the States than I. I will not knowingly support any measure that substantially invades this principle. There seems to me, sir, to be little gained in our devotion to this principle by closing our eyes to the fact that many changes have been wrought since their early application to conditions as they then existed. New conditions have given rise to mutual obligations between the States and Federal Government, which, though they were not thought of, perhaps, when the Constitution was adopted, make them none the less wise to observe and none the less binding upon both. They involve no stretch of the Constitution and call for no change unless it be by constitutional methods. I believe in calling upon the Central Government for nothing that the States can do for themselves, but as our social and industrial conditions progress in their wonderful development, we are met with broader, more complex, and more comprehensive problems. Necessarily, more arise which, in the proper and efficient administration of government, call for the exercise of both State and Federal powers.

I for one regard the fact that both may be called into exercise as a source of governmental strength and not of weakness. The improvements in transportation and communication which have been developed in the last half century have revolutionized the commercial and industrial system of the whole country and made it impossible for the States to deal single-handed and alone with many of the problems presented thereby. There is no policy more clearly recognized or more firmly established than that of Government aid to the schools of the States. This is fully shown in the Congressional land-grant act of 1862 and the act of 1890, appropriating to each of the States \$25,000 for educational purposes. It seems to me to be peculiarly appropriate that the proceeds arising from the lands which are otherwise held to become homes for American citizens should be applied to the education of the American youth in the direction of the agriculturist and the home builder. I have heard

and read something of the reluctance of the American youth to enter the military service of the country. We are being urged from certain quarters to make the Army more attractive, in order that enlistments may be easier. If I remember correctly, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs stated on the floor of the House a few days ago that the Army was 22,000 short of its authorized strength. I for one am ever ready to make ample provision for the necessities of sufficient military force to form the nucleus about which the American citizen may rally in time of danger and defend this country and overcome her foes; but I want to say that it must not be forgotten that supplies by which our armies are to be fed, clothed, and maintained, and our ships paid, our pension rolls met, must be produced by another army that pitches its tents on the country side and gives constant battle to the elements with plow and with blade.

Let them fail to keep step with the advancing seasons but for a day, and want and famine threaten the prosperity of the realm. The failure of their labors for a season means more to this Republic than the advance of a foreign foe upon her borders. Recruits, sir, for this army have been hard to enlist, and to-day it is millions short of its authorized strength. Something must be done to make its ranks more attractive. The rural districts must be made more inviting. Agriculture, home economics, and the mechanical arts must be elevated to the dignity of the professions. The welfare, the peace, the strength, and stability of this nation depend more upon contentment and prosperity in the rural home than upon all other conditions combined. If country life in America is made so inviting and remunerating as to turn back the flow from the farm to the overcrowded cities, our greatest cause of disturbance in social conditions will have been removed. Better than this, it will bring about by proper and normal methods that equal distribution of wealth, without which no people can attain their highest development or long continue patriotic. If we are to preserve the typical American, the greatest product of the human family, we must protect and perpetuate the environment by which he was produced. We have spent worlds of money upon the Army and Navy, and this is not saying we have spent too much. We have erected monumental buildings in almost every city and fair-sized town in the country, but we have contented the rural districts with little more than a package of garden seed and a Government publication.

The Agricultural Department, established with many misgivings, has accomplished more on less money than any other Department of the Government. They have reduced agriculture to a science and disclosed in it possibilities that invite the highest aspirations of the American youth. Realizing that the best results can not be attained without a rural population, educated along the line they are to travel and up to a proper appreciation of the beauties that surround them, they are urging upon the country the necessity of taking substantial steps toward providing for the rural youth this character of education. Much has been done by the States and National Government to provide for the establishment of colleges and universities throughout the country. This has largely been supplemented by denominational institutions and munificent endowment by philanthropic individuals. We are not suffering for want of facilities for higher education in aesthetical and classical learning. This is essential to our well-being, and I am proud that it is true, but what I wish to impress is that education should be so imparted as to serve some other purpose than to hold out to the farmer boy the allurements of becoming President of the United States or attaining renown and distinction. Let him be taught that there is no field of activity in which education of the right sort can be employed to a better advantage than in agriculture and the industrial arts. Upon all sides there are evidences of a return of the original idea that the farm should produce the food, raiment, and implements demanded by its own necessities. The cheap factory-made articles that have so long flooded the country do not meet every demand.

A plainer and more substantial furniture is sought, and creations in wood, iron, and brass are engaging the attention of the artisan. The handicrafts that afford opportunity for originality and development of talent, cut off by the automatic and monotonous processes of the factory, are beginning to afford once more a profitable and engaging vocation. The rural districts are full of opportunities which only need the education which pertains to such things to realize and appreciate. The tendency of the age has been in the direction of grand achievement and great things. The busy marts of trade and commerce, the domain of finance, and the dizzy heights of professional and political fame have been held out to the youth of our country as the only fields worthy of his ambitions or in which his labors would meet with the highest reward. This is wrong. It has driven the farmer boy from the old homestead, where opportu-

nities of the highest order lay within his touch, to take his place as an obscure atom in the mass of humanity that crowd and trample upon each other in the great cities of the land. Let us open his eyes to the beauties and the possibilities and the independence that may be his in the realms remote from towns. Mr. Chairman, for this purpose these hills, these streams, and these forests are his.

#### THE RIGHTS OF THE STATE IN NATIONAL FORESTS.

The National Government has long been committed to the policy of appropriating the public domain to the people for homes. In this way the West has been settled; the lands have been added to the taxable values of the States and produced the funds by which roads and schools have been maintained. If the public domain is to be reserved in forests that produce a revenue, the net proceeds should go to the States for the maintenance for agricultural schools for the people. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, when I had the floor during the day I intended to ask unanimous consent, in a general way, to include in my remarks data that I did not wish to take the time of the House to read on the floor, but it seems from the stenographer's notes that the language in which the request was framed might possibly be construed to apply only to the special topic that I was immediately discussing at the time. I hope the House will not object to having the request expressed in the terms in which it was intended.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, it was impossible for me to hear the request of the gentleman from Kansas, because he spoke in such a low tone of voice. I would like to know what the request is?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Scott], as the Chair understands it, asks that the stenographer's notes may be corrected to express his request for the unanimous consent, which was granted.

Mr. SULZER. If it were granted, why do not the stenographer's notes show it?

Mr. SCOTT. I was, perhaps, unfortunate in expressing myself, I have just explained to the House, and the language I used might possibly bear the interpretation of applying only to the particular bureau which I was discussing at the time.

I desired, of course, permission to include in my remarks data relating to any part of the bill, which I did not wish to take the time of the House to read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BURLESON. I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Sulzer] that some of this data was requested by other Members who were listening to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Scott]. They requested he put certain information in his speech, and he told them he would.

Mr. SULZER. The point I desire information about is this: If the data the gentleman now wants to insert in the RECORD as a part of his speech is relative to the bill under discussion?

Mr. SCOTT. Absolutely. I had intended to use it as a part of my speech, but so much of my time was taken up by inquiries that I did not feel like reading it.

Mr. SULZER. Another interrogatory, and that is: If this request is granted by the House, does the gentleman think the Member from Illinois [Mr. Mann] will move to-morrow to strike it out?

Mr. SCOTT. I am willing to take my chances on that.

Mr. SULZER. Then, I will not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes that I expect to occupy, I wish to direct attention to a bill (H. R. 19247) introduced by me, and which I will incorporate in my remarks, which provides that a label giving the date of inspection shall be attached to every can containing meat products inspected and passed by the Government:

A bill (H. R. 19247) to provide for the labeling of cans, pots, tins, and other receptacles containing meat or meat food products when hermetically sealed and prepared for foreign or interstate commerce.

Be it enacted, etc., That when any meat or meat food products, prepared for interstate or foreign commerce, which has been inspected as provided by the "Act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907," approved June 30, 1906, and marked "Inspected and passed," shall be deposited and hermetically sealed in any can, pot, tin, or other receptacle in any establishment where inspection under the provisions of said act is maintained, the person, firm, or corporation preparing said products shall cause a label to be attached to said can, pot, tin, or other receptacle, which label shall state the date when the contents were placed therein and that the contents thereof have been "Inspected and passed" under the provisions of said act. And no inspection and examination of meat or meat food products deposited and hermetically sealed in any can, pot, tin, or other receptacle in any establishment where inspection is maintained under said act shall be deemed to be complete until such meat or meat food products have been hermetically sealed in said can, pot, tin, or other receptacle; and no meat or meat food products shall

be sold or offered for sale by any person, firm, or corporation in interstate commerce under any false or deceptive name, but established trade name or names which are usual to such products and which shall have the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture are permitted.

In offering this amendment to the meat-inspection law I fully appreciate that I am approaching dangerous ground, ground so sacred to a certain powerful interest. I have not forgotten the fierce contest that took place here two years ago between the American people and the beef trust. On one side stood 99 per cent of the American people backed up by our worthy President, the most fearless, conscientious, resolute, and well-meaning President that ever occupied that chair; the people quietly in their homes, attending to their own affairs, writing letters to their Members, and praying and pleading for Congress to enact some law to protect the meat consumer and the meat producer against fraud and deception; on the other side the beef trust, with its large army of representatives, or so-called "lobbyists," here in Washington, and, indeed, they were here in large numbers. It has been said that every hotel and boarding house was filled from basement to garret with these exceedingly polite and generous men and women, and that you could hardly board a street car without running into a number of them hanging onto the straps. It has been said that they were as thick here as field mice are in the wheat fields of Colorado at stacking time. Mr. Chairman, they were swarming in and around this Capitol as thick as blackbirds out West in the springtime. Indeed they were here in large numbers. It was an incident long to be remembered, one that has been characterized as the most shameful and humiliating spectacle ever witnessed.

If you will read the RECORD, you will find that Congress was overwhelmed and overpowered, and that surrender was made necessary by sinister and bad motives, and through the influences of this trust and as a result the trust got what it wanted, and the people were left to pay \$3,000,000 annually and suffer, which is a sufficient and striking illustration of the dangerous power to which this powerful and greedy trust had attained in this country.

Gentlemen, when I think of the influences and the power exercised by this trust in the past, when I think of its activity in the past and the present, when I think of the results, when I think of the unsuccessful efforts on the part of a few in the interest of a "square deal" for the meat consumer and the meat producer, and when I think of the audacity, the effrontery, and the extraordinary methods that have been employed by a trust recognized as the most powerful in politics and elsewhere, I may be taking great chances in introducing this amendment, for it has been said that a candidate for office in a district or State in which this trust operates in politics, without its influence and support, would be as helpless as a cat without claws in the burning regions below. But, gentlemen, as I do not owe my position in Congress to them, I offer this amendment, and will support it with what ability and strength I possess, regardless of consequences. I offer it as a sworn duty, as it concerns the life and health not only of the American people, but to a large extent the people of the world.

Mr. Chairman, under present laws the meat products put up in cans, which may be as old as the hills, spoiled, poisoned, putrid, and as rotten as can be, by reason of age, may be sold without hindrance of law, thereby sending many to an early grave. How long is this to be continued? The answer is, until Congress acts.

If our markets for these products at home and abroad are to be maintained, this legislation is required. If our integrity, dignity, and standing with the world is to be maintained, this legislation is required. Good policy requires it; common sense and justice demands it.

Is this Congress to turn a deaf ear to this just demand for legislation that is desired by 99 per cent of the American people—by every man and woman who believes in conserving the life and health of human beings; a demand coming not only from the cattle raisers of this country, but from the merchants and the consumers of meat products—in fact, everybody who believes in the preservation of human life, integrity, justice, and a square deal—legislation that is necessary in order to maintain our markets, our dignity, and standing, to protect the consumers against imposition, deception, and fraud, and give everybody the information which he has a right to—that is, that he may know exactly what he is buying and eating? Have not the people a right to know what they are paying their money for when they purchase a can of food product? If so, why not legislate so as to put an honest stamp of approval on the American product, and thus not only protect the consumer against imposition and fraud, but to foster our foreign trade?



The spirit of our pure-food laws is that all canned food products shall be sold for just what they are, and that no misbranding and deception shall be tolerated. Why, then, not put the date of inspection upon all cans? The beef trust says no. That is what they said two years ago when this matter was under consideration and when the representatives of the trust and so-called "lobbyists" were here. Their contention at that time was that the contents of cans five or even fifteen years old was just as good as that five days old.

Will anyone believe it? No, gentlemen, the argument is so absurd that it would hardly seem worthy of any consideration. But as this is about the only argument produced, let us look into it. If the contents of a can are as good and as salable when five or ten years old as when five or ten days old, why not when twenty-five or fifty years old? If the contents of a can five or ten years old are as good and as much desired as five or ten days old, what harm can come to the packer in dating the can? Even if it is as good, has not the consumer or the purchaser of the can a right to know whether it is five days or fifty years old? If it is as good, why are the labels melted off, or washed off by hot water, and new labels put on, as stated by Mr. Wilson, who represented the packers, if it is not to make the purchaser believe that the contents were put in recently? This of itself is a fraud and is no valid reason why the date should not be put on. Everybody knows that everything decays, that food products decompose, and deteriorate, become stale, putrid, poison, and rotten in time, and it is only a question of time.

We know that a food product eaten under one condition may be healthful, while under another it is deadly; and it seems to me that the people are entitled to know. As has been stated here to-day, the spirit of all our pure-food laws is that no misbranding or deception is to be tolerated. It seems to me that we should legislate now so as to preserve the integrity of this article and protect its markets.

As has been referred to here to-day, millions of pounds of fresh meats are being sent abroad and accepted without any question being raised if inspected and passed by our Government; and it seems to me that the date of approval ought to go on all of these cans, so that the canned goods can be sold as well as the fresh meats. We know that canned meat eaten under one condition may be healthful and under another condition may be deadly. Then why not state the date of inspection upon the can? The answer is the beef trust objects. It insists that the deadly, poisonous, and spoiled meat, by reason of age, shall be sold as well as the wholesome, palatable, fresh, nutritious, and healthful. The contention is that as long as the can is in good condition, as long as the contents is kept from exposure to air, the product is kept from spoiling, but as soon as the can is opened, or holes rust through, the meat becomes unfit for food and injurious to health. Even if that statement were true, the statement is a confession that the contents of the can can not be kept in good condition for any number of years. Anyone who knows anything about the quality of tin manufactured and sold to-day knows that it is less resistant to rust, deterioration, and corrosion than tin made years ago. Anyone who has ever owned a tin pail, or a tin pan, or tinware of any kind, knows that it lasts only a few months and not for a number of years. Therefore their argument falls to the ground. It is all rot. It is as rotten as the contents of a five-year-old can.

But they say that this would be a hardship on the merchant. Oh, they would have us believe now that they have a deep-rooted interest in the welfare of the merchant; that it is for him they are fighting, for his interest and not their own. Gentlemen, think of the absurdity of this.

Notwithstanding the fact that inconsistencies have been defended and pictured as virtues, yet there are those who still believe "consistency, thou art a jewel." Evidently the trust believes in the recent teachings—or, in other words, it is for anything to get the "coon."

Think of their inconsistency. If the canned product is as good and desirable when five years as when five days old, what difference does it make to the merchant whether the date of inspection is on the can or not if it does not hurt the sale of the can? What should he care about the label? The trust knows, as everybody else does, that the date upon the can exposes the age and quality of its contents. It knows that very few, if any, will buy stale, spoiled, poisoned, or rotten meat—that is, if they know what they are buying—and that if these goods are to be sold at all it must be by deceiving the purchaser. It would then have you believe that the merchant is anxious to deceive—to sell his customer spoiled meat. Mr. Chairman, what an insult to our merchants. What merchant will resort to such a practice? Can anybody name a single merchant who would resort to such a dishonest method and hope to succeed in business? No; as a general thing successful

merchants are honest. What a misconception it is on the part of some who believe and contend it is the dishonest man who succeeds in life, in private or public. A merchant known to be dishonest and crooked in his dealings is generally a merchant without business. On the other hand, let the merchant be known to be upright, fair, square, and just in all his dealings, and he will have the confidence and respect of all.

The motto of the successful merchant, or successful man, either in public or private life, is to part with anything and everything rather than with conscience and rectitude of purpose. He is dominated by the more noble and lofty ideals; he has a firm determination to do justice and right, shunning deceitful and cunning practices. His guiding star is integrity, justice, and a square deal; and what the merchant wants is straight, sound, honest goods, not shelf-worn, spoiled, or poison food products to sell to his customers. Let a merchant deceive his customers by selling one of these poisoned cans, and when the contents are eaten and a member of the family dies from eating it, as happens very frequently, can the merchant hope to hold his trade? No, he will lose not only his trade, but the confidence of his neighbors, if he is found out, and of course he will be found out. The neighbors will attend the funeral, the papers will give an account of the poisoning and death, and the innocent merchant will soon be without a business. The fact is, the merchant wants to know what he is buying and selling. He wants the best, the fresh, and the healthful product. He is not in the deceiving business; his reputation is at stake; his honor is at stake; his trade and his business are at stake. He knows what quality to buy, and buys only enough at a time to sell before it gets spoiled, and needs no warning or suggestions against overstocking, and is not concerned about the "bugaboo" that he might be caught with a few old cans. He wants goods that will sell—not kill. He does not believe in fostering trade by fraud, and he, too, believes that concealing the date of inspection or the age of the article is a fraud on the consumer, and believes, as do 99 per cent of the American people, that the date of inspection should be stamped on the can.

Mr. Chairman, there can be no question but that all are entitled to know the date when the Government inspection occurred, the date when the Government put a stamp of approval upon the article which is to go out in the whole world, carrying with it the official approval of the United States.

If in the opinion of any purchaser the food in the cans that have been put up from five to thirty years is just as good or better than it was when inspected and passed or canned, let them buy it and eat it. Nobody objects. But, as before stated, it is the spirit of all our pure-food laws that no misbranding or deception is to be tolerated; that everybody is entitled to know just what he is buying and eating. The war office of Great Britain takes the precaution to provide in the contracts for the purchase of food for the soldiers that the date shall be put upon the can. Is not the American soldier entitled to as much consideration and the same protection as is given the soldiers of Great Britain? Why feed the American soldier on spoiled and poisoned meat? Is that position defensible in logic or morals? No; they have a right to know. Have we forgotten the scandal and our experience in the purchase of meat for the Spanish-American war soldiers? Is that experience to be repeated? How long are the people to be denied this protection against deception and fraud which involves health and life? Mr. Chairman, I believe that the greatest disappointment the people have met with from Congress was when Congress failed to require the packers to stamp the date of inspection upon the cans of meat, so that the purchaser might know just what he was buying and paying for; that he might know whether he was buying sound, fresh, and healthful food, or stale, spoiled, poisonous, or rotten meat. As was stated, it was a legislative abortion to provide for meat inspection in order to protect the people from fraud and imposition and then leave out one of the most important elements—the label—thereby enabling the beef trust to deceive the consumer by selling him a product good or bad, healthy or deadly, poisonous or sound. Think of it! Congress weak enough to yield to such an outrage! Are we to repeat the error and such an injustice?

Mr. Chairman, as stated, I believe that the greatest disappointment that ever came to the American people, the greatest disappointment ever meted out by Congress, was when in this legislation, in its attempt to protect the consumer against fraud and deception, it left out this most essential element. As was stated, it was a legislative abortion to try to legislate against this fraud and deception and to leave out this element—the most important one—giving information that was needed.

We have heard much about these disappointments, and indeed the people have met with many disappointments. You remember that the people were here knocking at the door of Congress, praying and pleading with Congress to protect them

against the counterfeit—oleomargarine. Later on they were knocking at the door of Congress, patiently waiting, pleading, and praying for Congress to enact some law in some way to regulate the transportation rates. They were here at the doors for a number of years patiently waiting and pleading for Congress to give sufficient appropriation that would enable the independent packers to continue their business, but in place of increasing appropriations Congress, in its wisdom, saw fit to reduce appropriations, thereby practically denying the independent packers and the people the protection and encouragement which they were entitled to just as much as the trusts. As you know, for years they were here urging Congress to make appropriations. Then came the appointment of the O'Neill-Reynolds Commission and its report; then the gold brick handed out by the committee; then the President's letter, and then the present law, but with a gold tooth in it, requiring a \$3,000,000 filling every year, and, besides, denying the people this information—the dating of the can.

Let us consider the proposition on its merits. In this short time I have tried to point out some of its merits and why this should be done. If you will investigate, I believe you will find this legislation is highly important and justly required in order to protect the cattle raisers, the meat producers, our market at home and abroad, and to protect the consumers of canned meat food products against deception and fraud; to conserve the life and health of the sweet children, the infant, the invalids; and to maintain our dignity, integrity, and standing with the world. Gentlemen, we have heard much about this annual appropriation, aggregating upward of \$1,000,000,000. It has been said that much of it is being absolutely wasted by reasons of unbusiness-like and unstatesman-like procedure by Congress and elsewhere. Yes; about the disregard for justice, and for the best interests of 80,000,000 intelligent, loyal, and patriotic people. We have heard much about the rules of this House. They have been denounced in the most bitter terms as degrading, infamous, humiliating, hideous, autocratic, oppressive, inconsistent—

Mr. BURLESON. And tyrannical.

Mr. HAUGEN. And, as the gentleman from Texas says, tyrannical. But I am not here to criticise the rules. I am not here to quarrel with anyone. I have met nothing but the kindest treatment at the hands of everybody. I am here to quarrel with no one, nor am I here to talk against the rules, nor am I here to question the judgment or motive of anyone in this House. I give everybody the credit of being as honest and sincere in their convictions as I am; but I say, much has been said about the rules. Others have denounced the rulings as illogical and unjust. We have heard much about the humiliating position these rules have put not only the Members in, but 80,000,000 of intelligent, independent, and liberty-loving people; of 390 Members surrendering their independence, right, and power, reducing themselves to mere recording secretaries. Much has also been said about committee appointments, criticising the method by which they are made.

Mr. Chairman, if all that has been said and done be true—robbing the people of their money and property by making unwise and unnecessary appropriations, humiliating and robbing them of their independence and right in this House or anywhere else, would be a great wrong; but to permit them being robbed of their health and life is also a great wrong and an unpardonable sin.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know that I have accurately caught the last expression of the gentleman. Does he think there is any sort of antagonism between the right of the House of Representatives to express itself by majority vote and the opportunity of the American people to be protected by the action of the House of Representatives?

Mr. HAUGEN. The rights of the people are certainly protected by the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the gentleman believe with me, that if the House of Representatives had an opportunity to represent its will by a majority vote, the House of Representatives would, in that majority vote, represent the will and interests of the American people?

Mr. HAUGEN. The majority always rules, and rules in this House as everywhere else, or ought to—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I understand the gentleman to assert that the majority does rule in this House?

Mr. HAUGEN. It certainly does. If the majority of the House surrenders its power it is to blame, and no one else is to blame except the majority, because it would be the error of the majority.

Mr. WILLIAMS. With that I perfectly agree.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am not here to criticise the rules.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And upon that question solely I am criticising the majority of the House.

There is no doubt about the fact that if the majority of the House consents to surrender its power, the majority of the House is responsible, and there is no doubt about the further proposition that when a majority of the House representing a party consents to surrender its power, that party is responsible.

Mr. HAUGEN. I see no reason for criticising the present House any more than the Democratic House. We have practically the same rules as we had under Democratic administration. A great many suggestions have been made, and it is possible that the rules can be improved upon. I am not here to criticise the rules. I could offer amendments to them which I would like to see adopted, and which I think might improve those rules, but I am not sure but that the present rules are just as good as they could possibly be made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman is right about that. Now, let me ask the gentleman a question. When at the beginning of this Congress and at the beginning of the last Congress and at the beginning of the Congress before that the Committee on Rules reported the body of the rules, together with the resolution forbidding all amendment, did or did not the gentleman vote for the resolution?

Mr. HAUGEN. I certainly did. I certainly voted with the majority.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, did or did not the gentleman cut himself off from the right to do just what he now says ought to be done, to wit, to amend the rules in some particular.

Mr. HAUGEN. I have never been deprived of a single privilege or right in this House, and until I am, I have no reason to find any fault with the rules, and as I say, it is possible that these rules could be improved upon, but I am not here discussing this proposition. I simply want to make myself clear, that I have no quarrel with anyone, nor have I any questions to raise as to the present rules at this time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have occupied as much time as I care to, except to say, Let us consider this proposition on its merits. I have tried to point out some of its merits and why this legislation should be passed. I believe that it is important; I believe that if you will investigate you will find that it is important in order to maintain our markets at home and abroad. It is necessary in order to conserve the health and life of human beings, of children, infants, and invalids, not only in America, but in all parts of this world wherever these products are sold. I believe that we should now legislate so as to maintain the integrity of this article. What can be said against it? The only thing that I know of is that the all-powerful and greedy trust is against it and there is danger that on the morning after next election, should you support this amendment, you may find your political carcass outside of the breastworks, if this trust has the power and influence to put it there. But if you see this as I do I believe you will place the life and health of human beings above the glory of holding office. That distinguished, eloquent, and patriotic statesman, Patrick Henry, said:

Is life so sweet, is peace so dear as to be purchased by bondage and slavery? Oh, God Almighty, forbid it! I know not what course you may take, but for me, give me liberty or give me death.

I would paraphrase that and say, "Is the glory of holding office so sweet as to be purchased by the life and health of not only the American people, but the people in every land where this product is sold? I do not know what course you will take, but for me, give protection to life and health, even at the expense of political life." [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, during the Fifty-ninth Congress I was a member of the Agricultural Committee. I was placed there upon the recommendation of the minority leader, the Hon. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, upon the written request and indorsement of 101 Democratic Members out of a total Democratic membership of 137 in that Congress. During my service upon that committee I discharged every duty devolving upon me with the utmost fidelity and in accordance with the conscientious convictions of my own heart. During that service I came in direct conflict with the seed trust, which sought to have the provision making appropriation for the seed stricken from the bill. It was stricken out in the committee, but was restored in the House upon an amendment offered by me. But for the adoption of my amendment, or one like it, no farmer in this whole country would have received a package of seed from his Member of Congress or Senator, and no lady in this broad land would have received a package of flower seed. While a member of the committee I also helped frame the meat-inspection law, which requires the beef trust to furnish the people pure and wholesome meats.



I insisted that the bill be specific and effective. There were some provisions which Mr. LAMB of Virginia and Mr. Bowie of Alabama and I thought ought to go into the bill to make it the more effective, but which were left out of the bill when reported from the committee. We therefore made a minority report, and two out of the three provisions we contended for were adopted by the House. I also favored appropriations, within constitutional limitations, for good roads. Since I have been in Congress I have done all I could in the interest of rural mail delivery and all the mail facilities for the people. In other words, without going further into details, as a member of the committee and as a Member of Congress I have favored such measures as I honestly believed would be most helpful to the farmers of this country, believing as I do, that when you contribute to the prosperity of the farmers you at the same time help every other vocation, trade, calling, profession, and interest in the land. [Applause.] At the beginning of this session of Congress the Speaker, in the exercise of the power conferred upon him by the rules of this Republican House, removed me from the Agricultural Committee and assigned me to other committees, although I was again recommended for membership upon the Agricultural Committee by the minority leader [Mr. WILLIAMS], and although Mr. WILLIAMS vigorously protested against my removal and although I am assured my continuance upon the committee met the unanimous approval of all the Democratic Members.

My removal from the committee, however, has not diminished my interest in the agricultural people nor cooled my ardor to labor for their welfare. The Speaker had the power to take me off the committee, but, thank God, he has not the power to prevent me from being heard upon this floor. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The only power which could thus close the door of opportunity to me is that exercised by the patriotic, chivalrous, noble, and loyal Mississippians who live in my district; and until they demand my retirement I shall continue to work earnestly and faithfully for them and to speak out boldly for their interests and the interests of the people of my beloved country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am a candidate for reelection, and to my people I shall appeal for their indorsement and a vindication of my record at the ballot box, and I have no doubt as to what the result will be. [Applause.]

I have examined the bill that is now pending before the House and which is under consideration. The appropriations in it are somewhat larger than the bills which have preceded it, and in the main I find that its provisions are wholesome and good, and I am glad that it has the unanimous indorsement of every member of the committee and that there will therefore probably be no serious controversy in reference to its adoption by the House.

While the appropriations provided in this bill are somewhat larger than the appropriations in bills which have preceded it, still I must say that I do not believe that they are as large as they might have been in the interests of the people of the country and for the development of the agricultural welfare of this great land. I can not well conceive of how money could be better expended than by using it for the purpose of developing the agricultural interests and for the purpose of lending a helping hand to those who by their toil and in the sweat of their face not only earn their own living, but take care of the welfare and the prosperity of the country which we all love. I have taken occasion to inquire into and investigate the appropriations made for the various other Departments of this Government, and I have not taken mere hearsay in reference to what they were, but I have asked for official statements from the Cabinet officers of the various Departments and have obtained them in that way, showing the appropriations made for the various Departments during the last ten years. I want to call attention to these appropriations and contrast them, at least to some extent, with the appropriations which have been made for the Agricultural Department, the benefits from which were so beautifully and eloquently described by the distinguished chairman of the committee to-day in his closing remarks.

I find, upon investigation, that the appropriations for the Interior Department from 1898 to 1907, inclusive, amount to the enormous sum of \$1,641,767,440.57; for the War Department, \$1,582,638,679.47; for the Post-Office Department, \$1,473,402,938; for the Navy Department, \$876,411,705.35; for the Treasury Department, \$443,153,997.52; for the Department of Justice, \$82,270,200.31; for the Agricultural Department, \$50,257,730.46; for the Department of Commerce and Labor in the five years that it has been in existence, \$46,581,074.99; for the State Department in ten years, \$19,840,267.89. The average appropriation for each one of these Departments per year for the last ten years is as follows: Interior Department, \$164,176,744.05; War

Department, \$158,263,867.94; Post-Office Department, \$147,340,293.80; Navy Department, \$87,641,170.53; Treasury Department, \$44,315,399.75; Department of Justice, \$8,227,020.03; Agricultural Department, \$5,025,773.04; Department of Commerce and Labor, \$9,316,214.99; State Department, \$1,984,026.78.

From these figures we find that this Government has expended for the War and Navy Departments combined for the past ten years, from 1898 to 1907, inclusive, the enormous and almost inconceivable sum of \$2,459,050,384.82. The average annual appropriation for the War Department and Navy Department combined is \$245,905,038.48, forty-nine times as much as the amount appropriated for the Agricultural Department for the same length of time. It seems to me that we are spending more money for brass buttons and for battle ships and for show than there is any necessity for spending, and neglecting our internal improvements in this country, and neglecting the development of the agricultural interests of the country, while taxing the people with enormous taxation to sustain this marvelous expenditure and not giving them back "a square deal" nor due return for the money which they are required to pay. It seems to me that we should cease exhibiting our seemingly warlike tendencies at such enormous expense and make more liberal appropriations to the peaceful pursuits of our people and seek the fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah recorded in the blessed book of God's eternal truth in the second chapter of Isaiah and fourth verse, as follows:

And He shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

Let us teach that this is a time of peace and not a time of war and that the greatest prosperity, the greatest happiness that can be brought to the people of the land is to give them peace, furnish them comfort, secure them prosperity, and let them enjoy the good things they produce by honest toil and patriotic service to our great country. [Applause.]

The first appropriation for agriculture was made in 1830, and the amount appropriated was the paltry sum of \$1,000. The total appropriations for the Agricultural Department for the sixty-nine years up to date amount to only \$84,328,920.09, and the annual appropriation for the Agricultural Department since its organization to now has been the small and pitiful sum, in comparison with the enormous amounts which I have mentioned, of but \$1,240,131.17. The above shows what Congress is doing for agriculture. What has agriculture done for the country?

May we take a few simple illustrations and incidents in order that we may see what it is doing for the country and for the welfare of the people? Take, for instance, durum wheat. In 1899 the Department of Agriculture spent \$10,000 to import durum wheat seed from Russia and Africa. That crop last year was worth \$30,000,000 to this country. That crop alone is worth six times the average yearly appropriation for the whole Agricultural Department.

Take cotton, the great product of the South, and what do we find it has accomplished for the people? Last year the valuation of the cotton crop was \$675,000,000; and we exported \$482,000,000 worth of cotton, that brought that much gold to the United States of America. Oh, how glad were the hearts of the people made throughout this country whenever the telegrams would go flashing over the wires and be published in the public print during this panic which has been pending and which is still going on, that some vessel from across the ocean was bringing millions of gold back to this country.

Do you know what was bringing it back? It was not our tariff laws. It was not the laws upon the statute books. It was the product of the farmers of the Southland who were sending their cotton to the foreign countries and in return bringing back the gold to replenish our coffers and to relieve the money situation among our people. It is not your law upon the statute books that maintains your gold standard. It is the cotton of the South, which is the great leveler between this and foreign countries, that is bringing the gold to this country and bringing, or contributing at least to bring, the balance of trade to our shores.

Take another instance, namely, that of tobacco. In the years 1901 to 1906, inclusive, there was paid into the United States Treasury as internal taxes on tobacco alone the sum of \$296,669,359.19, an average of \$49,444,893.13 per year. The total appropriations for the Agricultural Department for the same six years amounted to only \$32,573,770. The tax paid on tobacco, one agricultural product, for one year alone would practically pay all the expenses of the whole Agricultural Department for the past ten years, and the amount paid for six years is more than three times as much as the total appropriations for the whole Department of Agriculture for the sixty-nine years of its existence.

If you would appropriate the money arising from this one agricultural product, we could take care of the whole Agricultural Department and furnish it with a great deal more money than it has ever had or ever received from the National Government otherwise, and help the farmers all over the country with bountiful hand.

What further do we find? By reference to Secretary Wilson's report, on page 18, we find these marvelous figures: The grand total of the farm products of this country for 1907 is \$7,412,000,000. This is \$657,000,000 above the value of 1906, \$1,103,000,000 above that of 1905, \$1,253,000,000 above that of 1904, \$1,495,000,000 above that of 1903, and \$2,635,000,000 above the census amount for 1899. The value of the farm products of 1907 was 10 per cent greater than that of 1906, 17 per cent over 1905, 20 per cent greater than 1904, 25 per cent over 1903, and 57 per cent over 1899.

I said a moment ago that the agricultural products brought the balance of trade to our shores, and here are the official figures in reference to that, to which I call your attention.

The Secretary says:

The farmer is concerned in the nation's balance of international trade. \* \* \* In eighteen years, beginning in 1890, the farmers have not failed to secure a balance of at least \$193,000,000, the low amount of 1895. The great aggregate of the eighteen balances in the trade in farm products is \$6,500,000,000, while the trade in other commodities during the eighteen years resulted in a grand adverse balance of \$456,000,000.

In other words, but for the farmers of this country the balance of trade, taking into consideration all the other exports of every kind in this country of every kind and description, would have been against the United States to the amount of \$456,000,000, but taking into consideration the export of farm products in connection with all the other exports of the country, it cancels the \$456,000,000 and leaves a balance in favor of the United States of \$6,500,000,000.

In view of these remarkable results, I want to ask you if you believe the farmers of this country are getting "a square deal?" Why not make liberal appropriations for them? I favored liberal appropriations for the Department and for the betterment of agriculture while I was a member of the committee, and I shall continue to favor liberal appropriations—not extravagant appropriations, not useless appropriations, but appropriations that I believe are for the welfare of the country.

Why not make fair, reasonable, and liberal appropriations, when we find that to-day there is an available cash balance in the Treasury of \$263,589,960.05? Why let it lie in the Treasury of the United States, accomplishing no good purpose, when we can make appropriations that would benefit the people and spend some of this money among those who help to produce it, and in this way restore confidence and the prosperity which we so much need to-day?

The truth of it is I do not believe the farmers are getting "a square deal." They are entitled to greater consideration at the hands of Congress than they are receiving. Why do you, like the taskmasters of Egypt, lay burdens upon them grievous to be borne and do so little for them? Why not do something for them that would go directly to their welfare and for their benefit?

I have introduced during this session of Congress a bill for the relief of the farmers of the United States. It is a bill to repeal the tariff duty, and place upon the free list agricultural implements, wagons, farm tools, axes, nails, horseshoes, harness, cotton gins, bagging, and ties, and various other articles in every-day use on every farm throughout this broad land. The passage of this bill would save the farmers millions of dollars and leave the money in their pockets.

Why are you not willing to report that bill? Why will you not at least report something in that direction? Why do you "stand pat" and refuse all revision of the tariff and give no relief of any kind whatever? Why do you not take some action to give some relief from the panic from which we are suffering? When this Congress met last December the first committee appointed by the Speaker was the Committee on Banking and Currency. It was appointed before the Committee on Rules, before the Committee on Appropriations, before the Committee on Ways and Means, or any other committee, but still to-day we have no results. We hear no sound upon the floor of the House looking toward relief from present conditions.

You said if the people would give the Republican party absolute control of the country in every branch of the Government and a high protective tariff that would be security against panic. You said, further, if the gold standard was adopted that would absolutely secure against panic.

But you are now in control of every branch of the Government. You have the Senate, the House of Representatives,

and the President, and you have the highest tariff ever known in this country, and the gold standard, and with all these combined you did not prevent panic. The people trusted you and you have deceived them. It is your panic and you are responsible for it. Why don't you do something to relieve it?

I introduced a bill on the currency question. I have not time to discuss it or go into details with reference to it, but if you would report and pass my bill much good would result from its enactment. Not only that bill, but no other bill has up to this hour been considered. Why not do something to help the country, and why not do something to relieve present conditions? You have "stood pat" until you are the "obstructionists," and you can no longer lay that at our door. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. JOHN M. NELSON, of Wisconsin, asked you some very pertinent questions a few days ago, and I desire to repeat some of them—

Why not revise the tariff to the extent, at least, of removing the protection now afforded to some of the notorious trusts and combinations of the country? Why not consider an income tax to adjust the burdens of taxation among the people? Why not consider an inheritance tax, so as to return a part of the "swollen fortunes" of the "predatory classes" to the people, from whom these fortunes were unrighteously taken? Why not consider amendments to the antitrust laws, in order to strengthen the Department of Justice in the prosecution of some of these gigantic combinations that oppress the people? Why not empower the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix a valuation of the railways of the country, in order to "squeeze out the water" and ascertain a fair basis of rate making? Why not consider measures for the suppression of gambling in stock and dealing in futures, practices that depress prices on the products of the people at times so disastrously?

Mr. LEVER. To what party does Mr. Nelson belong?

Mr. CANDLER. The gentleman belongs to the Republican party, but he asked some splendid questions, showing that a gentleman can not always be judged by the company he keeps. Good things sometimes come out of Nazareth. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I introduced a bill to prevent stock gambling and gambling in futures. That bill sleeps in the committee room. Why don't you report and pass it? Why don't you relieve the press of the country of the terrible tribute they are paying the paper trust by putting wood pulp on the free list? Are you surprised there are demands coming from all over this country for relief from these conditions, for relief from exorbitant taxation, for relief from the gambling spirit that runs riot in the land? Why don't you report and pass some bill restricting immigration, and stop the scum of Europe from coming here? For God's sake, do something for the people or get out of the way and let us do something. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am not surprised, therefore, in view of this situation, that the minority leader [Mr. WILLIAMS] to-day read the "riot act" to you and served notice on you that something must be done by the party in power, or he would resort to every parliamentary means possible to enforce action of some kind. What are you going to do about it? I present these issues to you and to the country, and if you do not act the people can and will make you act or hurl you from power. [Applause.] The bill now pending before the House ought to receive the careful consideration of every Member by reason of the vast interest with which it deals and its purposes to elevate and dignify the great and basic pursuit of American citizens.

The countless millions of our population are fed and clothed by the American farmer. The grain waving in golden beauty upon the great plains of the West, the cotton drifting like summer snow upon the fields of the South, freight the fleets of nations and loose their sails, thread the continents with tracks of steel, fill the earth with the roar of trains, and heap for trade and commerce and useful art those stores that make a nation great. Where are the sinews of our strength, if they are not found in our great, diversified agricultural products? What victorious hosts ever waved as joyous banners as those that float above the tasseled maize from the snows of Maine to the spicy groves of California? What spirit of beauty hovers above Southern fields when fleecy bolls uncover to crown "King Cotton!" [Applause.]

What a marvelous power, that has defied for all these years grievous political wrong more destructive than pestilence and more cruel than war! What a marvelous people, that have borne without revolt assaults upon their interest by legislative bodies and a merciless war by monopolies upon their great pursuit! What other people in your midst can you rely upon so implicitly in peace or in war? Who filled the great armies in that immortal struggle of the blue and gray and baptized American valor anew in an ever widening and brightening fame? [Applause.]

There are sylvan retreats all over this land, sequestered nooks rich in idyllic charm, sacred forever more to warrior spirits who



left these quiet scenes at their country's call to return no more, unknown and yet immortal. In obedience to that pure and holy patriotism their survivors, without regard to geographic division, have waited for a proper recognition of the great agricultural interests, not alone upon capital that has sought and justified every pretext for their robbery and spoliation, not alone upon trusts and combines more hurtful than floods and frosts, but upon the American Congress they have waited in the vain hope that their numbers, their wealth, their intelligence, and, more than all, their devotion and importance would secure for them just legislation.

While they have waited they have witnessed many novel occurrences. They have seen a money panic in times of plenty, manufacturers arrayed against them, common carriers levying their freights to their manifest injury, Standard Oil companies waxing mighty upon their substances, gamblers in futures gloating upon their productions, everywhere hostile organizations, everywhere lurking assassins; yea, even the very arches of her temple have rung to the footfalls of treason when agricultural statistics were juggled in the interest of monopoly.

But despite these hostile surroundings, despite storm and flood and drought, they annually add billions of wealth to the American people. They annually feed and clothe our vast population. They annually export to other countries such a vast surplus of food and raw material that the tax even upon the importations paid for by these agricultural products is sufficient to pay the vast expenses of the Government and, under existing laws, to fill the Treasury with dead and useless capital. They light the fires in every forge; turn the countless wheels of industry everywhere; gird continents with glittering threads of steel and hurrying steeds of fire; white the seas with the sails of commerce; pour upon all lands and all peoples and every human pursuit the fatness which their toil has wrought from the earth. [Applause.]

But light is breaking upon their long night. They, too, are combining for their protection; this great host who have in their keeping every political possibility of this Government are organizing. The accused policy of producing panics can not always fetter them; the cry of overproduction can no longer deceive them; inferior consideration by the Government can no longer satisfy them. They ask, and they intend to have, just and fair legislation, because their pursuit is the basis upon which the general welfare rests. Who shall oppose them in

their righteous demand? Who shall stay them when they summon their clans? Can you fetter the ocean? Can you arrest an avalanche?

Can you deny justice to millions of your long-suffering and confiding countrymen? Shall the policy of building up one pursuit at the expense of another be eternally continued? Or shall our policy be, like the sun in his beneficent journey as he lights the summit and the valley, to favor honest toil and industry everywhere, until the cry of classism shall cease from the land, until self-reliance and sturdy independence shall regain their power, and the American people, with deserved trust in their officers and Representatives, shall satisfy the world that this great country, under the guidance of God and the aegis of liberty, belongs to no class or set of people, but to the whole people, who are accomplishing with brain and brawn and great forbearance the marvelous destiny of freedom's great empire? [Great applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have these reports, letters, and statements from the various Departments of the Government, which are official, showing the figures that I have used in the remarks that I have just made. I should like to have unanimous consent to print them as an appendix to my remarks, without any additions to them or taking anything from them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

#### APPENDIX.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, February 27, 1908.

Hon. E. S. CANDLER,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Referring to your letter of the 24th ultimo, requesting a statement of the expenses of this Department for each year for the last ten years, with the proportionate increase in the appropriations made for the Department during these years, I have the honor to transmit herewith the following statements:

1. A tabulated statement showing the amount of the principal appropriations made for the Department and the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal years from 1898 to 1907, both inclusive.

2. A tabulated statement of the expenditures made from the said appropriations.

These statements cover all the principal appropriations made for the Department (during the said period), as it is understood that you desire the same only for comparative purposes.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

ROBERT BACON, Acting Secretary.

Appropriations for fiscal years 1898 to 1907.

Appropriations.	1898.	1899.	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.
Salaries, Department of State	\$120,020.00	\$125,420.00	\$130,070.00	\$136,489.44	\$147,830.00	\$159,926.40	\$177,770.00	\$175,520.00	\$180,420.00	\$208,970.00
Stationery and furniture, etc.	6,000.00	6,000.00	6,543.68	7,000.00	6,000.00	7,500.00	6,000.00	6,500.00	6,500.00	7,000.00
Lithographing	1,200.00	1,200.00	1,200.00	1,200.00	1,200.00	1,200.00	1,200.00	1,200.00	1,200.00	1,200.00
Books and maps	2,000.00	1,500.00	2,000.00	3,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00
Contingent expenses, Department of State	3,546.93	3,721.54	4,021.21	4,212.06	4,472.55	5,000.00	6,000.00	5,000.00	6,200.00	7,000.00
Editing revised and annual statutes		4,000.00	4,000.00	4,000.00	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Salaries, ambassadors and ministers	347,500.00	350,000.00	342,500.00	350,000.00	361,381.60	372,000.00	374,635.87	385,500.00	403,500.00	438,500.00
Salaries, chargé d'affaires ad interim	30,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00	31,706.84	30,413.76	30,476.68	30,024.35	36,098.25	45,523.91	40,000.00
Salaries, secretaries, embassies and legations	51,275.00	54,075.00	59,400.00	62,400.00	68,003.78	73,650.00	76,890.42	81,325.00	81,050.00	109,225.00
Salaries, interpreters to embassies and legations	10,500.00	10,500.00	10,504.40	10,500.00	10,500.00	20,500.00	20,500.00	23,750.00	23,750.00	31,000.00
Contingent expenses, foreign missions	149,799.37	152,983.97	145,598.33	225,000.00	175,103.53	200,001.97	218,028.41	211,000.00	220,000.00	225,000.00
Salaries, consular service	545,000.00	567,000.00	545,447.80	552,500.00	575,269.24	614,481.19	630,369.60	658,300.00	681,300.00	1,034,500.00
Salaries, consular clerks	15,200.00	15,200.00	15,200.00	15,000.00	14,800.00	14,600.00	15,000.00	14,600.00	14,600.00	15,000.00
Salaries, marshals for consular courts	9,300.00	9,300.00	9,300.00	9,300.00	9,300.00	9,300.00	9,300.00	9,300.00	10,300.00	11,000.00
Allowance for clerks at consulates	105,770.00	103,170.00	105,170.00	114,530.00	122,550.00	130,350.00	134,400.00	136,700.00	153,060.00	227,210.00
Salaries, interpreters to consulates	15,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00	15,800.00	16,050.24	15,800.00	20,800.00	20,800.00
Expenses, interpreters and guards in Turkish dominions	8,000.00	8,000.00	8,000.00	8,000.00	8,000.00	8,042.99	8,000.00	8,000.00	10,000.00	12,000.00
Repairs to legation and consular premises	2,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	5,000.00	6,500.00	3,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00
Contingent expenses, United States consulates	216,218.17	228,665.91	229,822.81	263,248.44	264,901.89	302,759.12	301,793.24	315,000.00	320,000.00	350,000.00
Expenses of prison for American convicts	14,100.00	14,100.00	14,100.00	12,550.00	13,150.00	13,150.00	13,150.00	13,150.00	13,150.00	13,150.00
Expenses, consular inspectors										* 15,000.00
Clerks at embassies and legations										* 68,000.00
Transportation of diplomatic and consular officers										* 45,000.00
Total	1,652,429.47	1,705,836.42	1,680,878.23	1,840,636.78	1,836,379.35	1,984,338.35	2,046,112.13	2,103,743.25	2,201,358.91	2,788,555.00

Amounts shown include deficiency appropriations.

\* After July 1, 1901, appropriated for under head of "Salaries."

\* Student interpreter.

\* New appropriation; not made prior to 1907.

## Expenditures for fiscal years 1898 to 1907.

Expenditures.	1898.	1899.	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.
Salaries, Department of State.	\$118,487.98	\$122,387.55	\$120,441.01	\$136,022.58	\$143,597.91	\$156,833.41	\$166,408.45	\$171,113.89	\$175,590.00	\$212,166.86
Stationery, furniture, etc.	6,004.80	5,697.20	5,588.18	6,982.71	6,000.00	7,499.09	6,039.13	6,497.12	6,491.04	6,994.77
Lithographing.	1,200.00	1,200.00	1,200.00	1,200.00	1,200.00	1,200.00	1,150.85	1,200.00	1,200.00	1,200.00
Books and maps.	1,996.60	1,492.22	1,956.41	2,984.70	2,000.00	1,997.66	1,999.19	1,999.63	1,991.55	1,955.01
Contingent expenses, Department of State.	3,522.25	3,496.74	4,242.75	4,217.44	4,472.55	4,999.79	5,999.92	4,949.93	5,985.60	6,968.27
Editing revised and annual statutes.		4,000.00	3,999.75	2,500.00	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Salaries, ambassadors and ministers.	326,445.66	314,529.14	323,747.51	323,818.36	351,174.76	346,143.05	359,741.25	359,192.73	351,744.73	410,124.97
Salaries, chargé d'affaires ad interim.	16,430.15	23,597.96	27,222.84	37,726.25	34,251.71	32,676.49	37,605.05	32,691.34	45,467.49	36,124.20
Salaries, secretaries embassies and legations.	39,575.80	43,826.93	49,157.81	44,417.64	52,476.87	60,519.08	62,113.29	62,163.11	65,605.87	75,799.83
Salaries, interpreters to embassies and legations.	10,500.00	10,250.00	10,220.10	10,500.00	10,500.00	12,983.98	18,176.67	18,153.55	19,128.94	23,438.72
Contingent expenses, foreign missions.	145,077.34	140,490.59	140,568.96	181,839.02	169,597.67	185,584.63	214,892.65	173,919.79	216,117.17	215,378.12
Salaries, consular service.	535,394.43	522,833.19	534,360.61	558,005.75	563,635.08	594,277.23	620,475.08	635,477.00	660,632.83	1,063,116.11
Salaries, consular clerks.	13,267.68	13,407.61	11,849.05	14,453.77	13,969.41	12,905.13	12,493.65	13,070.00	13,850.00	12,933.32
Salaries, marshals for consular courts.	8,314.23	8,800.00	6,731.34	6,351.23	7,413.58	7,607.11	7,900.74	4,502.83	7,080.01	750.00
Allowance for clerks at consulates.	101,574.46	99,748.87	100,926.75	107,202.57	116,210.33	124,897.49	130,854.44	132,276.99	144,504.73	201,918.64
Salaries, interpreters to consulates.	13,521.74	14,835.02	15,917.93	14,841.75	14,342.52	15,799.89	16,050.24	15,113.36	12,979.42	13,089.55
Expenses, interpreters and guards in Turkish dominions.	7,600.00	7,360.30	6,410.00	7,491.55	7,880.97	7,992.99	7,773.32	7,748.89	9,575.36	10,360.84
Repairs to legation and consular premises.	882.58	1,341.80	170.80	2,324.54	4,785.13	2,072.89	3,972.87	4,933.92	3,910.82	4,491.08
Contingent expenses, United States consulates.	204,901.25	224,315.27	232,538.86	247,805.62	260,551.26	291,196.72	307,256.59	306,087.14	273,782.71	340,241.98
Expenses of prison for American convicts.	6,081.28	5,170.54	3,880.12	3,031.76	4,574.93	4,598.32	5,390.12	5,192.26	4,222.31	4,888.63
Transportation of diplomatic and consular officers.										45,000.00
Clerks at embassies and legations.										41,106.97
Expenses of consular inspectors.										11,554.34
Total.	1,560,868.23	1,568,780.83	1,600,580.78	1,713,752.24	1,768,634.63	1,871,785.01	1,986,313.50	1,956,373.53	2,019,830.17	2,714,632.29

\* After July 1, 1901, expenditures on this account included in salaries.

## RECAPITULATION.

Total of appropriations—	
1898	\$1,652,429.47
1899	1,705,836.42
1900	1,680,878.23
1901	1,840,636.78
1902	1,836,379.35
1903	1,984,338.35
1904	2,046,112.13
1905	2,103,743.25
1906	2,201,358.91
1907	2,788,555.00
Grand total	19,840,267.89
Total expenditures—	
1898	1,560,868.28
1899	1,568,780.83
1900	1,609,580.78
1901	1,713,752.24
1902	1,768,634.63
1903	1,871,785.01
1904	1,986,313.50
1905	1,956,373.53
1906	2,019,860.17
1907	2,714,632.29
Grand total	18,770,581.26

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF CLERK,  
Washington, February 3, 1908.

Hon. E. S. CANDLER, Jr.,  
House of Representatives, Washington.

SIR: Your letter of the 1st instant is received. It is noted that you desire a statement showing the appropriations and expenditures for the postal service for the last ten years and not the statement forwarded with my letter of the 31st ultimo, showing such figures for the Post-Office Department proper.

The statement desired by you with regard to the postal service is transmitted herewith.

In this connection, I desire to state that numerous efforts were made by this office to locate you by telephone to ascertain if you desired the figures concerning the postal service. Your previous letter of the 29th ultimo called for the figures in relation to the Post-Office Department.

Respectfully,

M. O. CHANCE, Chief Clerk.

## Appropriations for the postal service for the fiscal years 1892 to 1907.

Fiscal year.	Appropriations postal service.	Increase over previous year.	Per cent of increase.
1892	\$77,907,222		
1893	79,829,115	\$1,921,893	2.46
1894	84,004,314	4,175,199	5.23
1895	87,236,599	3,232,285	3.84
1896	89,545,997	2,309,398	2.64
1898	95,665,338	3,093,774	3.34

## Appropriations for the postal service, etc.—Continued.

Fiscal year.	Appropriations postal service.	Increase over previous year.	Per cent of increase.
1892	\$99,202,300	\$3,536,962	3.69
1900	105,627,138	6,424,838	6.47
1901	113,658,238	8,031,100	7.63
1902	123,782,688	10,124,450	8.90
1903	138,416,598	14,633,910	11.82
1904	153,511,549	15,094,951	10.90
1905	170,845,998	17,334,449	11.28
1906	181,022,093	10,176,095	5.95
1907	191,670,908	10,648,905	5.83

## Expenditures for the postal service for the fiscal years 1892 to 1907.

Fiscal year.	Expenditures postal service.	Increase over previous year.	Per cent of increase.
1892	\$76,980,846	\$3,921,327	5.36
1893	81,581,681	4,600,835	5.97
1894	84,994,111	3,412,430	4.18
1895	87,179,551	2,185,440	2.57
1896	90,932,669	3,753,118	4.30
1897	94,077,242	3,144,573	3.45
1898	98,033,523	3,956,281	4.20
1899	101,632,160	3,598,637	3.67
1900	107,740,267	6,108,107	6.01
1901	115,554,920	7,814,653	7.25
1902	124,785,697	9,230,777	7.98
1903	138,784,487	13,998,790	11.21
1904	152,362,116	13,577,629	9.78
1905	167,309,169	15,037,053	9.83
1906	178,449,778	11,050,609	6.60
1907	190,238,288	11,788,510	6.60

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, January 30, 1908.

SIR: In reply to your communication of the 24th instant, I have the honor to give below a statement showing appropriations and disbursements in the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Disbursements from all appropriations made for the support of the Department of Commerce and Labor:

Fiscal year ended June 30—	
1903	\$24,979.94
1904	10,361,875.56
1905	11,272,391.45
1906	10,508,185.87
1907	11,279,517.73

\* This amount covers disbursements for the period from February 18, 1903, to June 30, 1903, during which period no payments were made on account of bureaus and offices transferred to the Department of Commerce and Labor.



Appropriations made for the support of the Department of Commerce and Labor:

Fiscal year ended June 30—

1903	\$24,979.94
1904	11,072,140.39
1905	11,399,415.10
1906	11,653,924.99
1907	12,430,614.57

If the information given in this letter is not sufficient for your purposes, please advise me, specifying along what lines you desire further information.

Yours, very respectfully,

HERBERT KNOX SMITH,  
Acting Secretary.

Hon. E. S. CANDLER, Jr.,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Total appropriations for five years, 1903 to 1907, inclusive, \$46,581,074.90.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
Washington, January 28, 1908.

Hon. E. S. CANDLER, Jr.,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Sir: In response to your request of the 24th instant, I transmit herewith a statement showing the expenditures and appropriations under the Department of Justice for the fiscal years 1898 to 1907, inclusive. Judicial expenditures and appropriations include expenses of United States courts and the salaries of court officials.

The appropriations for the Department of Justice proper for the fiscal year 1899 include an item of \$1,000,000 for a new Department building, \$932,792.68 of which was ultimately covered back into the Treasury.

Respectfully,

CHARLES J. BONAPARTE,  
Attorney-General.

Statement showing expenditures and appropriations under the Department of Justice.

	Expenditures.	Appropriations.
1898:		
Department of Justice	\$371,145.58	\$375,761.23
Judicial	6,769,165.32	7,770,647.25
Total	7,131,310.90	8,146,408.48
1899:		
Department of Justice	383,132.50	1,426,585.38
Judicial	6,281,525.66	7,322,428.27
Total	6,667,658.16	8,749,013.65
1900:		
Department of Justice	436,733.03	405,252.52
Judicial	6,293,310.06	5,937,592.38
Total	6,730,043.09	6,342,844.90
1901:		
Department of Justice	435,608.17	455,331.98
Judicial	6,294,006.71	6,574,657.38
Total	6,729,614.88	7,029,989.36
1902:		
Department of Justice	473,903.04	522,137.44
Judicial	6,238,840.13	6,353,912.48
Total	6,762,743.17	6,876,049.92
1903:		
Department of Justice	500,894.39	1,146,903.41
Judicial	7,348,990.51	7,879,604.41
Total	7,939,884.90	9,026,510.82
1904:		
Department of Justice	635,139.78	726,689.31
Judicial	7,477,527.18	7,753,842.29
Total	8,112,666.96	8,480,531.60
1905:		
Department of Justice	683,025.03	726,438.48
Judicial	7,664,275.53	7,952,376.91
Total	8,352,300.56	8,678,815.39
1906:		
Department of Justice	704,548.62	671,165.95
Judicial	7,899,348.47	7,867,940.97
Total	8,603,897.00	8,539,106.92
1907:		
Department of Justice	829,592.25	979,043.97
Judicial	8,619,923.44	9,421,886.30
Total	9,449,499.69	10,400,930.27

Total appropriations for ten years, \$82,270,200.31.

\* This amount covers disbursements for the period from February 18, 1903, to June 30, 1903, during which period no payments were made on account of bureaus and offices transferred to the Department of Commerce and Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington, January 28, 1908.

Hon. E. S. CANDLER, Jr.,  
House of Representatives, United States.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with your request of the 24th instant, I submit herewith a statement showing the amounts appropriated for the Department of the Interior, its bureaus, offices, etc., under six general divisions, namely: "Salaries and expenses; salaries and contingent expenses, public land offices; Indian affairs; pensions; public works; miscellaneous," for the period of ten years, commencing July 1, 1898, and ending June 30, 1907.

This statement also shows the proportionate increase and decrease in the appropriations made in each year within that period of time.

As you are probably aware, the above six general divisions of appropriations are further subdivided into individual detailed appropriations, under 600 or more heads.

While it is not practicable at this time to prepare a statement showing the exact amounts expended from these many individual appropriations, it can probably be asserted, with a reasonable degree of correctness, that the amounts appropriated within this period of time have been practically expended, and the surplus, if any, from these individual appropriations, covered into the United States Treasury, is of no considerable amount.

Very respectfully,

JAMES RUDOLPH GARFIELD,  
Secretary.

Statement of appropriations made for the Department of the Interior for ten years from July 1, 1898, to June 30, 1907, showing increases and decreases of appropriations during that period.

Fiscal year 1898:	
Salaries and expenses	\$4,789,428.37
Salaries and contingent expenses, public land offices	170,424.23
Indian Affairs	7,668,073.82
Pensions	141,264,405.19
Public works	226,156.54
Miscellaneous	2,477,984.52
Total	156,596,472.67
Fiscal year 1899:	
Salaries and expenses	4,731,065.60
Salaries and contingent expenses, public land offices	168,459.80
Indian Affairs	8,680,621.14
Pensions	149,555,896.46
Public works	171,714.51
Miscellaneous	2,499,532.71
Total	165,807,290.22
Increase over prior year	9,210,817.55
Fiscal year 1900:	
Salaries and expenses	4,794,611.78
Salaries and contingent expenses, public land offices	163,350.00
Indian Affairs	8,234,865.74
Pensions	145,498,503.27
Public works	198,805.70
Miscellaneous	3,817,379.37
Total	162,707,515.86
Decrease under prior year	3,099,774.36
Fiscal year 1901:	
Salaries and expenses	4,880,002.58
Salaries and contingent expenses, public land offices	168,050.00
Indian Affairs	9,828,744.74
Pensions	145,245,554.35
Public works	351,506.84
Miscellaneous	12,180,634.40
Total	172,654,492.91
Increase over prior year	9,946,977.05
Fiscal year 1902:	
Salaries and expenses	4,933,549.97
Salaries and contingent expenses, public land offices	175,329.60
Indian Affairs	10,356,264.96
Pensions	145,260,350.00
Public works	1,446,975.71
Miscellaneous	6,785,536.06
Total	168,958,006.30
Decrease under prior year	3,696,486.61
Fiscal year 1903:	
Salaries and expenses	5,023,235.03
Salaries and contingent expenses, public land offices	175,820.93
Indian Affairs	9,941,299.29
Pensions	140,053,467.00
Public works	740,579.43
Miscellaneous	3,562,469.37
Total	159,496,871.05
Decrease under prior year	9,461,135.25
Fiscal year 1904:	
Salaries and expenses	5,129,720.39
Salaries and contingent expenses, public land offices	179,486.69

## Fiscal year 1904—Continued.

Indian Affairs	\$8,925,440.81
Pensions	139,931,325.00
Public works	1,469,589.40
Miscellaneous	3,790,293.38
<b>Total</b>	<b>159,425,855.67</b>
Decrease under prior year	71,015.38

## Fiscal year 1905:

Salaries and expenses	5,232,820.81
Salaries and contingent expenses, public land offices	176,700.90
Indian Affairs	10,247,033.56
Pensions	142,520,881.00
Public works	1,770,361.40
Miscellaneous	3,920,010.95

<b>Total</b>	<b>163,867,808.62</b>
Increase over prior year	4,441,952.95

## Fiscal year 1906:

Salaries and expenses	5,281,496.15
Salaries and contingent expenses, public land offices	178,395.64
Indian Affairs	8,454,477.08
Pensions	142,750,307.00
Public works	2,423,529.96
Miscellaneous	3,722,915.30

<b>Total</b>	<b>162,811,121.13</b>
Decrease under prior year	1,056,687.49

## Fiscal year 1907:

Salaries and expenses	5,153,237.93
Salaries and contingent expenses, public land offices	194,094.95
Indian Affairs	14,878,144.83
Pensions	143,746,106.15
Public works	1,667,500.00
Miscellaneous	3,802,922.28

<b>Total</b>	<b>169,442,006.14</b>
Increase over prior year	6,630,885.01

<b>Total appropriations for ten years</b>	<b>1,641,767,440.57</b>
---	-------------------------

Appropriations for 1907	169,442,006.14
Appropriations for 1898	156,596,472.67

Comparative increase in ten years (1907 compared with 1898)	12,845,533.47
---	---------------

Average annual expenditures for ten years, from July 1, 1898, to June 30, 1907	164,176,744.05
--	----------------

Total increase over prior years for ten years	30,230,632.56
Total decrease under prior years for ten years	17,385,099.09

<b>Difference</b>	<b>12,845,533.47</b>
-------------------	----------------------

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
 Washington, January 31, 1908.

Hon. E. S. CANDLER, Jr.,  
 House of Representatives.

SIR: In reply to your request of the 24th instant, I have the honor to inclose herewith a statement showing the appropriations and expenditures for the Treasury Department proper and its several bureaus and offices for the fiscal years 1898 to 1907, inclusive.

Respectfully,

GEO. B. CORTELYOU, Secretary.

## Statement of appropriations and expenditures for the Treasury Department and its bureaus for the fiscal years 1898 to 1907, inclusive.

	1898.		1899.	
	Appropriations.	Expenditures.	Appropriations.	Expenditures.
<b>Treasury Department proper</b>	\$3,175,909.79	\$3,074,323.46	\$3,281,806.32	\$3,183,817.00
Independent Treasury	589,932.73	508,635.66	600,483.76	599,685.25
Mint Establishment	1,171,839.66	1,128,172.18	1,583,828.83	1,488,270.92
Internal Revenue	5,039,854.90	4,902,511.15	4,469,130.71	4,499,146.87
Customs Service	13,231,394.77	14,183,007.18	17,791,823.36	16,921,647.34
Marine-Hospital Service	961,175.21	709,248.04	991,655.17	788,043.21
Life-Saving Service	1,633,398.00	1,537,740.00	1,593,999.80	1,522,003.35
Light-House Establishment	3,253,598.42	3,331,256.37	3,569,279.80	3,118,833.50
Bureau of Engraving and Printing	1,181,870.00	1,129,261.93	1,616,500.00	1,612,926.18
Steamboat Inspection Service	340,009.04	340,009.04	831,678.33	831,678.33
Coast and Geodetic Survey	509,931.27	478,007.84	707,072.30	659,412.43
Treasury buildings, etc.	8,000.00	13,908.40	8,000.00	7,964.77
Miscellaneous	3,100,193.83	3,322,684.24	3,663,912.32	3,691,474.59
<b>Total</b>	<b>31,297,137.65</b>	<b>34,746,855.49</b>	<b>40,211,765.73</b>	<b>38,484,903.74</b>

## Statement of appropriations and expenditures, etc.—Continued.

	1900.		1901.	
	Appropriations.	Expenditures.	Appropriations.	Expenditures.
<b>Treasury Department proper</b>	\$3,193,590.25	\$3,277,786.67	\$3,417,617.02	\$3,395,011.92
Independent Treasury	680,263.05	682,811.85	720,772.93	683,610.52
Mint Establishment	1,583,191.44	1,479,648.25	2,134,933.41	1,906,475.17
Internal Revenue	5,115,798.61	4,991,677.41	6,131,834.90	5,990,282.72
Customs Service	20,472,571.79	19,918,001.34	22,785,300.53	22,983,892.72
Marine-Hospital Service	1,058,618.89	982,495.77	1,220,793.81	1,240,192.37
Life-Saving Service	1,591,106.50	1,579,127.73	1,700,838.05	1,650,997.17
Light-House Establishment	4,090,362.97	3,556,840.70	3,894,590.72	3,638,838.53
Bureau of Engraving and Printing	1,820,466.41	1,807,169.59	2,108,069.81	2,058,598.21
Steamboat Inspection Service	316,140.85	316,140.85	354,929.90	354,929.90
Coast and Geodetic Survey	381,843.00	528,156.05	1,110,845.00	753,298.04
Treasury buildings, etc.	385,282.00	18,284.67	48,000.00	252,173.91
Miscellaneous	3,883,355.10	3,467,521.26	3,679,021.75	3,813,235.24
<b>Total</b>	<b>44,575,590.89</b>	<b>42,605,662.14</b>	<b>49,303,637.96</b>	<b>48,227,507.43</b>

	1902.		1903.	
	Appropriations.	Expenditures.	Appropriations.	Expenditures.
<b>Treasury Department proper</b>	\$3,687,785.41	\$3,533,329.24	\$4,001,085.82	\$3,816,800.94
Independent Treasury	673,340.00	683,544.89	720,840.00	704,203.54
Mint Establishment	1,558,697.37	1,535,666.06	1,599,237.56	1,456,220.57
Internal Revenue	8,965,204.87	8,536,348.58	11,098,979.95	10,608,813.60
Customs Service	21,590,535.20	20,929,263.78	21,463,724.73	20,997,153.92
Marine-Hospital Service	1,132,156.14	1,234,294.51	1,193,278.92	1,356,455.87
Life-Saving Service	1,732,136.90	1,667,688.48	1,821,266.58	1,746,811.19
Light-House Establishment	4,694,308.44	4,181,403.39	4,538,105.16	4,537,315.67
Bureau of Engraving and Printing	2,685,557.92	2,653,522.43	2,789,154.97	2,782,348.50
Steamboat Inspection Service	344,490.06	344,490.06	437,140.30	436,871.50
Coast and Geodetic Survey	612,065.31	838,832.07	1,141,525.20	865,215.78
Treasury building, etc.	8,000.00	99,426.10	384,600.00	71,097.20
Miscellaneous	3,226,576.69	3,341,340.81	2,992,471.75	3,170,084.93
<b>Total</b>	<b>50,930,824.31</b>	<b>49,579,120.40</b>	<b>54,181,540.45</b>	<b>52,574,426.21</b>

	1904.		1905.	
	Appropriations.	Expenditures.	Appropriations.	Expenditures.
<b>Treasury Department proper</b>	\$3,597,768.99	\$3,564,094.95	\$3,822,847.41	\$3,776,151.14
Independent Treasury	762,069.15	753,953.15	784,434.10	746,793.05
Mint Establishment	1,721,280.97	1,401,372.74	1,453,636.29	1,299,100.68
Internal Revenue	4,946,523.19	5,329,609.71	5,223,589.07	5,034,922.00
Customs Service	19,269,329.05	19,036,647.23	20,292,421.23	20,299,814.82
Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service	1,126,052.03	1,424,362.73	1,353,759.97	1,290,092.32
Life-Saving Service	1,848,578.50	1,779,443.69	1,843,288.38	1,840,505.21
Bureau of Engraving and Printing	2,756,629.20	2,756,163.65	2,916,887.82	2,866,340.62
Treasury building, etc.	139,500.00	182,489.41	83,100.00	164,423.63
Miscellaneous	3,277,800.52	3,250,340.17	4,032,965.06	3,692,537.85
<b>Total</b>	<b>39,445,541.69</b>	<b>39,478,573.46</b>	<b>41,809,959.33</b>	<b>41,010,679.82</b>

	1906.		1907.	
	Appropriations.	Expenditures.	Appropriations.	Expenditures.
<b>Treasury Department proper</b>	\$3,960,257.59	\$3,894,449.24	\$4,015,089.28	\$3,973,673.22
Independent Treasury	767,872.00	750,302.58	776,570.00	771,749.46
Mint Establishment	1,420,427.51	1,279,898.08	1,453,075.51	1,317,511.77
Internal Revenue	6,022,407.20	5,747,830.69	5,635,822.69	5,490,360.71
Customs Service	20,791,941.31	20,574,670.29	21,271,726.58	20,621,890.52
Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service	1,513,509.16	1,200,068.80	2,025,000.00	1,441,298.16
Life-Saving Service	1,896,352.84	1,843,012.24	1,875,598.76	1,795,481.66
Bureau of Engraving and Printing	2,918,840.00	2,914,726.84	3,509,365.43	3,347,859.93
Treasury building, etc.	18,050.00	66,807.61	227,903.58	12,104.48
Miscellaneous	3,580,189.74	4,284,423.85	4,661,000.96	3,854,444.48
<b>Total</b>	<b>42,829,847.35</b>	<b>42,556,253.22</b>	<b>45,465,152.79</b>	<b>42,623,353.39</b>

\* Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

\* Transferred to the Department of Commerce and Labor on July 1, 1903.

Total appropriations for ten years, \$443,153,097.52.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
 Washington, January 27, 1908.

Hon. E. S. CANDLER, Jr.,  
 House of Representatives.

SIR: As requested in your letter of January 24, 1908, I beg to inclose herewith a statement showing expenses of this Department for each



year for the last ten years and the proportionate increase in the appropriations during that period:

Fiscal year.	Amount expended.	Amount appropriated.	Increase over preceding year.
1898	\$2,425,510.44	\$2,467,002.00	\$19,138.47
1899	2,827,795.65	2,829,702.00	361,800.00
1900	2,947,603.42	3,006,022.00	176,320.00
1901	3,239,137.39	3,304,265.97	298,243.97
1902	3,902,675.79	3,922,780.51	618,514.54
1903	4,734,230.81	5,015,513.00	1,093,065.49
1904	4,969,311.64	5,025,024.01	9,178.01
1905	5,881,339.57	6,004,510.00	1,069,515.99
1906	6,000,327.33	7,175,600.00	1,081,150.00
1907	9,356,466.40	11,415,957.97	94,240,257.97

\* Includes permanent appropriation of \$3,000,000 for meat inspection.

Very respectfully,

JAMES WILSON, Secretary.

Total appropriations for ten years, 1898 to 1907, inclusive, \$50,257,730.46.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, February 1, 1908.

SIR: Replying to your letter of the 24th ultimo, requesting statements showing the expenses of the Navy Department for each year for the last ten years, also the proportionate increase, if any, in the appropriations made for the Department during these years, I have the honor to inclose herewith for your information a statement prepared by the Paymaster-General of the Navy, containing the desired information.

Very respectfully,

V. H. METCALF, Secretary.

Hon. E. S. CANDLER, JR., M. C.,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Statement showing expenditures on account of the naval establishment and amounts appropriated during each fiscal year from 1898 to 1907, inclusive.

For fiscal year.	Payments on account of the naval establishment.	Amounts appropriated for the naval establishment.	Turned into the surplus fund.
Balance on hand July 1, 1897		\$13,553,313.17	
1898	\$55,241,742.75	119,895,468.34	\$199,032.81
1899	65,373,667.88	53,043,383.61	171,012.70
1900	55,435,006.75	53,627,691.70	19,828,224.29
1901	60,433,393.42	65,588,508.87	6,855,504.69
1902	67,193,368.76	83,631,779.37	1,765,693.80
1903	80,890,581.93	80,919,923.15	982,604.31
1904	102,102,758.20	87,256,759.68	9,331,822.30
1905	114,883,583.21	112,351,876.27	1,002,950.44
1906	107,939,835.13	102,203,312.11	1,472,275.56
1907	95,031,249.30	104,385,689.89	1,002,223.74
Balance on hand June 30, 1907	805,619,217.33	876,411,705.35	42,591,364.64
Turned into the surplus fund	43,657,964.23		42,591,394.64
Total	849,277,181.56	833,820,340.71	

The excess of payments over amounts appropriated, less amount turned in to the surplus fund (\$15,456,840.85), is due to payments from funds not appropriated for by Congress, such as the clothing and small stores fund, Naval Hospital fund, naval supply fund, pay of the Navy deposit fund, and ordnance material proceeds of sales, which are included in the first column.

The large amounts turned into the surplus fund during the years 1900 to 1904, inclusive, are mostly the unexpended balances of the emergency fund and other special appropriations incidental to the Spanish war.

E. B. ROGERS,  
Paymaster-General, United States Navy.

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, January 28, 1908.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 24th instant, requesting a statement showing the expenses of the War Department for each year for the last ten years; also the proportionate increase, if any, in the appropriations made for the Department during these years, and in reply I have to inform you that the following amounts represent the total of all appropriations made by Congress for the War Department and expenditures therefrom for the fiscal years 1898 to 1907, both inclusive:

Fiscal year.	Appropriations.	Expenditures.
1898	\$96,281,219.52	\$94,105,449.83
1899	354,400,849.64	274,723,209.62
1900	119,235,293.23	137,559,764.93
1901	166,434,630.39	147,474,425.83
1902	142,141,949.23	114,565,426.95
1903	136,556,830.02	121,639,383.46
1904	112,294,177.97	119,538,275.31
1905	132,344,544.23	124,907,742.77
1906	90,158,703.85	117,779,442.11
1907	175,690,508.69	123,879,540.74
Total	1,582,638,679.47	1,376,172,652.60

Very respectfully,

ROBERT SHAW OLIVER,  
Assistant Secretary of War.

Hon. E. S. CANDLER, JR.,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
BUREAU OF SOILS,  
Washington, D. C., February 13, 1908.

Hon. E. S. CANDLER, JR.,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CANDLER: I submit herewith the memorandum which you requested in regard to internal-revenue taxes on domestic and imported tobacco manufactured in the United States, compared with the total amounts of the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the same years, from 1901 to 1906, inclusive. The years 1907 and 1908 are also added on the departmental appropriation. I trust that this may reach you in time.

I have the honor to be, very sincerely,

J. A. BONSTEEL.

Total internal revenue derived from taxes imposed and collected on domestic and imported tobacco manufactured.

Fiscal year—	
1901	\$62,481,907.13
1902	51,937,925.19
1903	43,514,810.24
1904	44,655,808.75
1905	45,659,910.50
1906	48,422,997.38

Total 296,669,359.19

Total amounts of appropriations, Department of Agriculture.

Fiscal year—	
1901	\$4,029,500.00
1902	4,582,420.00
1903	5,208,960.00
1904	5,968,160.00
1905	5,902,040.00
1906	6,882,690.00

Total 32,573,770.00

1907 9,932,940.00  
1908 9,447,200.00

To the Representatives and Senators in Congress:

We, the undersigned, members of faculties in universities and colleges, and educators of New York City, voicing, as we believe, the sentiments of many thousands of American citizens, earnestly protest against the extravagant demand for an addition of over \$60,000,000 in the form of four new battle ships, cruisers, etc., to the naval budget of last year, inasmuch as no danger threatens the country not known last April, when President Roosevelt told the world: "We are no longer enlarging our Navy. We are simply keeping up its strength. The addition of one battle ship a year barely enables us to make good the units which become obsolete."

Sixty-five per cent of the national income is now expended on war, past and present. The increase of our naval budget has recently been used in the French Assembly as a reason for increasing its own; is largely responsible for the increase of armaments among Asiatic nations, and is well-nigh certain to retard that reduction in the armaments of the world for which we have so long been waiting.

The growing discontent throughout the world at the appalling increase of waste of national resources must be heeded. We feel that this protest is the more necessary, inasmuch as there are various new and effective methods now available for promoting international friendship and rationally settling difficulties which these new demands seem to ignore.

William H. Maxwell, city superintendent of schools.  
John H. Finley, president of the College of the City of New York.  
Clarence D. Ashley, dean of the law school, New York University.  
Henry W. Leipsiger, supervisor of public lectures.  
John Bates Clark, Columbia University.  
George W. Kirchwey, dean of the law school, Columbia University.  
Charles P. Fagnani, Union Theological Seminary.  
Andrew W. Edson, associate city superintendent of schools.  
Samuel T. Dutton, Teachers' College, Columbia University.  
H. C. Bumpus, American Museum Natural History.  
Frederick Diehlman, College of the City of New York.  
Alfred G. Compton, College of the City of New York.  
James C. Egbert, Columbia University.  
James Voorhees, Columbia University.  
Francis H. Stoddard, New York University.  
Carl Lorentzen, New York University.  
James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University.  
Henry R. Seager, Columbia University.  
Edward L. Thorndike, Teachers' College, Columbia University.  
John Dewey, Columbia University.  
A. D. T. Hamlin, Columbia University.  
Calvin Thomas, Columbia University.  
Francis M. Burdick, Columbia University.  
J. E. Spingarn, Columbia University.  
J. R. Wheeler, Columbia University.  
Conzalez Lodge, Teachers' College, Columbia University.  
Herbert L. Osgood, Columbia University.  
Joseph French Johnson, New York University.  
D. W. Hering, New York University.  
Arthur B. Lamb, New York University.  
Dr. Henry G. Piffard, Columbia University.  
Charles Lane Poor, Columbia University.  
Louis Celamarre, College of the City of New York.  
George C. Scott, College of the City of New York.  
William J. Brewster, Columbia University.  
William G. McGuckin, College of the City of New York.  
Anna M. Olsson, principal Public School 141, Brooklyn.  
George Meason Whiteher, Normal College.  
Hiram H. Bice.  
Eugene H. Pool, M. D., Columbia University.  
F. W. Osborn, Adelphi College.  
James C. Reynolds.  
Edwin A. Greenlaw, Adelphi College.  
Ellen Murray, Public School 38, Bronx.  
Annie J. Farley, Public School 183.  
Isabel D. Fisher, Adelphi College.  
Agnes E. De Monde, principal Public School 116, Brooklyn.  
Kate S. Anthony, Horace Mann School.  
C. F. Chandler, Columbia University.  
May F. M. Aleer, principal Public School 188.

- Charles A. Beard, Columbia University.  
 Ernest Ilgen, College of the City of New York.  
 A. Beatrice Beard, Adelphi College.  
 W. E. Waters, New York University.  
 Ida Ikeller, Public School 68.  
 C. L. Speranza, Columbia University.  
 Frederick L. Ludgner, principal Public School 152, Brooklyn.  
 Mrs. Maria Kraus-Buelte, Kraus's Seminary for Kindergartners.  
 Mary C. Bergen, Public School 73.  
 K. R. Brady, Public School 151, Brooklyn.  
 Charles Perrine, principal Public School 110, Brooklyn.  
 Eliza S. Pell, principal Public School 96.  
 M. A. Regan, Public School 107.  
 A. B. Turner, College of the City of New York.  
 Joseph Allen, College of the City of New York.  
 Samuel Newman, College of the City of New York.  
 J. H. Grotecloss, Public School 11.  
 Margaretta Uehlein, Public School 54.  
 Henry C. Pearson, Teachers' College.  
 Gustave Le Gros, College of the City of New York.  
 Emma S. Saudrine, Public School 93.  
 Jeannette S. Sewett, Normal College.  
 Graham Lusk, New York University.  
 Henry Edward Crampton, Columbia University.  
 William M. Campbell, New York University.  
 Joseph S. Taylor, district superintendent of schools.  
 Elizabeth A. Duggan, Public School 57.  
 M. B. Coles, Normal College.  
 Cecile Freese, Horace Mann School.  
 Edmund Burke, College of the City of New York.  
 Ellen M. Phillips, principal Public School 131.  
 J. G. Bowtell, Normal College.  
 Royal Whitman, Columbia University.  
 A. G. Jacob, Jamaica High School.  
 H. F. Walker, Columbia University.  
 G. M. Swift, Columbia University.  
 George N. Boardman, Columbia University.  
 Edwin C. Broome, Adelphi College.  
 A. Henry Grant, Jersey City High School.  
 Samuel Ayers, Public School 132.  
 J. C. Gordy, New York University.  
 Caroline Emanuel, Public School 50.  
 Charles C. Roberts, Public School 25.  
 Emma L. Johnston, Brooklyn Training School.  
 M. A. Bigelow, Teachers' College, Columbia University.  
 Isabella Sullivan, Public School 170.  
 Maurice J. Thompson, Public School 6.  
 M. Allen Starr, Columbia University.  
 William E. Grady, Public School 64.  
 Ellen T. O'Brien, Public School 36.  
 Kate M. Falvey, Public School 78.  
 Jessie Ashley, New York University.  
 Jennie Birmingham, Public School 90.  
 Charles Blikie, Horace Mann School.  
 George Philip Krapp, Columbia University.  
 Augusta L. Cassidy, Public School 49.  
 Benjamin Veit, Public School 1.  
 William B. Coley, Columbia University.  
 M. B. Barringer, Public School 39.  
 Teresa C. Burke, Public School 121.  
 Downing Bain, New York University.  
 Clara American, Public School 127.  
 Gertrude Hirst, Columbia University.  
 William N. Story, Public School 34.  
 Elizabeth J. Hofer, Public School 174.  
 William J. O'Leary, Public School 5, Brooklyn.  
 Elizabeth V. Gaines, Adelphi College.  
 John F. Riegar, principal School 2.  
 Emma Sylvester, principal Public School 35.  
 Paul Monroe, Teachers' College.  
 V. E. Kilpatrick, principal Public School 52.  
 Millicent Baum, principal Public School 163.  
 William L. Ettinger, Public School 147.  
 Isaac Price, Public School 65b.  
 Olivia J. Hall, Public School 157.  
 James Sullivan, Boys' High School, Brooklyn.  
 Charles J. Pickett, principal Public School, 26, Bronx.  
 Margaret E. Maltby, Barnard College.  
 H. M. C. Vedder, New York University.  
 William L. Fuller, Girls' High School.  
 Charles Gray Shaw, New York University.  
 J. E. Kemp, Columbia University.  
 Florence M. Marshall, Horace Mann School.  
 W. L. Bulkley, principal Public School 80.  
 F. M. McMurry, Teachers' College, Columbia University.  
 William E. B. Starkweather, College of the City of New York.  
 John F. Harris, principal Public School 95.  
 M. F. O'Connell, principal Public School 31.  
 Jennie M. Tower, principal Public School 114.  
 Sadia E. Baird, Public School 48.  
 Helena A. Hulskamp, Elementary School 63.  
 Mary L. Brady, Public School 177.  
 Florence E. Viet, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn.  
 Mary A. Willis, Packer Collegiate Institute.  
 John F. Woodhull, Columbia University.  
 M. Adelaide Nutting, Teachers' College, Columbia University.  
 George N. Olcott, Columbia University.  
 Charles P. Berkey, Columbia University.  
 Julia Emery Turner, Packer Collegiate Institute.  
 E. L. Kuntz, Columbia University.  
 Joseph E. Messenger, New York.  
 Clarence H. Young, Columbia University.  
 Edith C. Squires, Packer Collegiate Institute.  
 E. Kelly, Public School 87, Brooklyn.  
 Lyman A. Best, Public School 108.  
 John J. Wells, Public School 35, Brooklyn.  
 M. D. Batchelder, Horace Mann School.  
 E. G. Sihler, New York University.  
 F. A. Irvine, Public School 68, Brooklyn.  
 Elenore E. Elliott, Public School 57.  
 Catherine P. Candler, Normal College.  
 E. Aubert, Normal College.  
 Herbert G. Lord, Columbia University.  
 Laura B. Collier, Packer Collegiate Institute.  
 E. F. Nichols, Columbia University.  
 Robert Peele, Columbia University.  
 Virgil Prettyman, Morace Mann School.  
 Thomas C. Baker, Public School 44, Brooklyn.  
 Bernard J. Devlin, Public School 13, Bronx.  
 M. E. Quinn, Public School 125.  
 Ella Keith, Normal College.  
 Kathleen M. Kullen, Public School 66, Brooklyn.  
 Margaret S. Winslow, Public School 18, Brooklyn.  
 Harriet L. Bogue, Public School 55, Brooklyn.  
 Gertrude E. Hale, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn.  
 Julia B. Anthony, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn.  
 Emily H. Welch, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn.  
 Edwin B. Uline, Public School 27.  
 Mary Walsemalm, Public School 8, Brooklyn.  
 Matilda C. Skine, Public School 20, Brooklyn.  
 M. W. Kennerly, Normal College.  
 M. J. Merritt, Public School 29, Brooklyn.  
 Joseph C. Pfister, Columbia University.  
 Mary A. Regan, Public School 31, Bronx.  
 William P. McCarthy, Public School 42, Bronx.  
 Mary C. V. Connolly, Public School 113.  
 L. A. McLauth, New York University.  
 Channing Rudd, New York University.  
 Charles C. Holden, Public School 17, Bronx.  
 James S. C. Wells, Columbia University.  
 James C. Rogers, Public School 128, Brooklyn.  
 Olin Cartridge, Horace Mann School.  
 Elizabeth F. Doherty, Public School 42, Brooklyn.  
 Henry C. Sherman, Columbia University.  
 Miss Miriam Werner, Normal College, New York.  
 William Fox, College of the City of New York.  
 Priscilla Fletcher, Normal College.  
 Henry E. Bliss, College of the City of New York.  
 C. Howard Parmly, College of the City of New York.  
 Sarah Goldie, Public School 190.  
 Kate M. Stephens, Public School 135.  
 Walter W. Arnold, Horace Mann School.  
 Ida E. Robins, Teachers' College, Columbia University.  
 Elizabeth M. Wheelock, Horace Mann School.  
 Edmund M. Foote, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University.  
 John S. Fitzpatrick, Public School 81, Brooklyn.  
 Augusta Beck, Public School 88, Brooklyn.  
 Kate Van Wagenen, Public School 2, Bronx.  
 Andrew E. Eichman, Public School 97, Brooklyn.  
 James E. Lough, New York University.  
 Louise Castle, Public School 92, Brooklyn.  
 Edward Bush, Public School 18, Brooklyn.  
 Curtis Claassen, New York University and Bellevue Hospital Medical College.  
 Leslie J. Tompkins, New York University Law School.  
 Gorham Bacon, Columbia University.  
 Carlos F. MacDonald, University and Bellevue Medical College.  
 Barclay W. Bradley, College of the City of New York.  
 Edward Mandell, Public School 188.  
 Mary A. Mason, Public School 79, Brooklyn.  
 Moses Becker, jr., Public School 118, Brooklyn.  
 Kate Morgan Ward, Packer Collegiate Institute.  
 Fred H. Sykes, Columbia University.  
 F. N. Cole, Columbia University.  
 David Sneddon, Columbia University.  
 Allan Abbott, Horace Mann School.  
 C. M. Baker, Horace Mann School.  
 Adolph Werner, College of the City of New York.  
 Emory B. Lease, College of the City of New York.  
 Marie-Louise Raoux, Normal College.  
 Mary Amelia Sheldon, Normal College.  
 Lewis F. Mott, College of the City of New York.  
 Charles A. Downer, College of the City of New York.  
 Marion S. Coan, Normal College.  
 Susan E. Van Wert, Normal College.  
 Thomas J. Meighan, Public School 27, Bronx.  
 L. G. Simmons, Normal College.  
 A. Wadsworth, Columbia University.  
 Frederica J. Constantini, Normal College.  
 Margaret Laing, Public School 117, Brooklyn.  
 Henry G. Kost, College of the City of New York.  
 Joseph G. Furey, Public School 123, Brooklyn.  
 Lilla A. Nourse, Columbia University.  
 Jefferson B. Fletcher, Columbia University.  
 Herbert M. Richards, Barnard College.  
 Marie H. Brooks, Horace Mann School.  
 John King Clark, Public School 23, Bronx.  
 Roland H. Williams, Horace Mann School.  
 Frank E. Brooks, Horace Mann School.  
 A. L. McDevitt, Public School 61, Brooklyn.  
 Maud V. Keyes, Horace Mann School.  
 Charles D. Raine, principal Public School 147.  
 Winifred T. Cullen, Public School 56.  
 E. G. Bridgman, Public School 111.  
 Lillian E. Rogers, Horace Mann School.  
 Mary E. O'Donnell, Public School 90, Brooklyn.  
 C. C. Calkins, Public School 3, Brooklyn.  
 M. Louise Rockwood, Public School 46, Brooklyn.  
 Honor E. Quinn, Public School 63, Brooklyn.  
 Lizzie F. Spafford, Public School 161.  
 C. F. Kayser, Normal College.  
 James T. Shorwell, Columbia University.  
 Eugenia C. Levie, Public School 124.  
 Walter B. James, Columbia University.  
 Isabella F. Wright, Public School 104.  
 N. B. Foster, Columbia University.  
 L. G. Forward, Bellevue Hospital Medical School.  
 Prince A. Movine, Bellevue Hospital Medical School.  
 Mary S. Woolman, Teachers' College, Columbia University.  
 Oliver C. Wordock, Public School 10, Brooklyn.  
 Marion Clarey, Public School 19.  
 Robert F. Smith, College of the City of New York.  
 Dorothy C. Hess, Normal College.  
 Mary G. Peabody, Horace Mann School.  
 H. H. Presby, New York College of Pharmacy.  
 Edward S. Page, Public School 77.  
 Margaret Knox, Public School 15.  
 J. Loaz, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn.



Freda M. Brunn, Adelphi College, Brooklyn.  
 Engenie Menut, Horace Mann School.  
 Stephen P. Duggan, College of the City of New York.  
 Linneas E. La Ferra, Columbia University.  
 L. Emmett Holt, Columbia University.  
 Charles P. Warren, Columbia University.  
 Emma J. MacAlarney, Horace Mann School.  
 J. D. Miller.  
 Charles F. Horne, College of the City of New York.  
 Frank Rollins, The Stuyvesant High School.  
 Leon Brummer, New York University.  
 Nathan Abbott, Columbia University.  
 George T. Holm, Columbia University.  
 N. Louise Roethgen, Adelphi College, Brooklyn.  
 Phillip D. Kurrison, University, Bellevue Medical School.  
 Franz Boas, Columbia University.  
 Carl Leonardo Speranza, Columbia University.  
 Frederick H. Wilkins, New York University.  
 Rudolph M. Binder, New York University.  
 Helen H. Tanzer, Normal College of the City of New York.  
 Mary J. McHench, principal Public School 114, Brooklyn.  
 Margaret M. Slattery, principal Public School 53, New York City.  
 Ella A. Caterson, Public School 21, New York City.  
 Julia C. Cremins, New York University.  
 Amanda C. Northrop, Normal College.  
 Jesse H. Bigham, Department of Manual Training, New York City.  
 Mabel L. Chesley, Erasmus High School, New York City.  
 Arthur Schultze, New York University.

Mr. SCOTT. I move that the committee do now rise.  
 The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER of Vermont, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 16493. An act limiting and restricting the right of entry and assignment under the desert-land law and authorizing an extension of time within which to make final proof;

H. R. 19408. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to donate to the Albert Sidney Johnston Camp, Confederate Veterans, of San Antonio, Tex., not to exceed fifty obsolete Springfield rifles, bayonets, and bayonet scabbards for same; and

H. R. 16621. To extend the time for the construction of a dam across Savannah River at Cherokee Shoals.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 3416. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the extension of Meridian place NW.," approved January 9, 1907.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following joint resolution and bills:

H. J. Res. 101. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to secure a suitable design for a statue of the late Commodore John D. Sloat at Monterey, Cal.;

H. R. 14434. An act to validate certain entries of public lands in the State of Colorado;

H. R. 16078. An act providing for second desert-land entries;

H. R. 16874. An act to amend section 13 of an act entitled "An act to divide the State of Texas into four judicial districts," approved March 11, 1902;

H. R. 17710. An act to increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Life-Saving Service of the United States;

H. R. 15660. An act to provide for the repayment of certain commissions, excess payments, and purchase moneys paid under the public land laws; and

H. R. 17167. An act authorizing the Woodlawn Cemetery Association, of St. Maries, Idaho, to purchase not to exceed 40 acres of land in the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation in Idaho.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a personal statement, which will only take a minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to make a personal statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hope that the gentleman's request does not require unanimous consent. I do not think it does; but if it does require unanimous consent, I am forced to object.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, suppose the gentleman gives us an idea of what he wants to say.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can submit to the Speaker the nature of his proposition. If it requires unanimous consent—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can state the nature of his proposition if he rises to a question of personal privilege or a privileged question. If he does not—

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a matter of personal privilege, but it is so unimportant that I hardly wish to take the attention of the House to this extent. On yesterday, after the first roll call, I paired with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GILLESPIE]. When the point of no quorum was made and there was a call of the House I voted. I should instead have answered "present." I have explained the matter to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GILLESPIE], and he does not care about it. I think, however, when one makes such a mistake, mention of it should be made in the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is clearly a matter of personal privilege, I think.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not agree with the gentleman; but the gentleman could ask unanimous consent, if he desired so to do, that the Journal be corrected in the way indicated by him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to object.

#### HOUSE BILL WITH SENATE AMENDMENTS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the bill (H. R. 16882) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service submitting an estimate of appropriation for pay of surfmen—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting a request for a reappropriation for a target range near Sparta, Wis.—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for armor and armament of the Navy—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19418) granting condemned cannon for Stony Point State Park, New York, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1298), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FOSS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19611) to further increase the efficiency of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1299), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MONDELL, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18970) providing for an enlarged homestead, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1300), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the joint resolution of the Senate (S. R. 48) instructing the Attorney-General to institute certain suit, and so forth, reported the

same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1301), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3843) for the relief of the legal representatives of Stewart & Co. and A. P. H. Stewart, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1295), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4690) for the relief of the legal representatives of Napoleon B. Giddings, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1296), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10416) to correct the naval record of Lieut. Hilary Williams, United States Navy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1297), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CRAIG, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17640) to authorize the issuance of a patent to the assignees of Warner Bailey for land located in Choctaw County, State of Alabama, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1303), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### ADVERSE REPORT.

Under clause 2, Rule XIII,

Mr. HOWARD, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10502) to amend the provision of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906, making an appropriation for continuing the work for the erection of the memorial to Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, and the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 117) concerning the location of the Grant Memorial in the District of Columbia, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1302), which said bill, resolution, and report were laid on the table.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles, which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 18847) granting a pension to Joseph P. Redman—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 18408) granting a pension to Nancy J. Stephens—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 19793) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," relative to gambling, and dealing in options and futures, and bucket shops—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 19794) to amend sections 2 and 3 of the act of June 27, 1890, in relation to pensions, and so forth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 19795) to promote the safety of employees upon railroads—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGLEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 19796) for the establishment of a park on the east side of the Bladensburg road, Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 19797) to validate certain certificates of naturalization issued in the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 19798) providing for the holding of the United States district and circuit courts at Hugo, Okla.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19799) to provide for the erection of a public building at Durant, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19800) to provide for the erection of a public building at Ada, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19801) to provide for the improvement of the Platt National Park, situated at Sulphur, Okla.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19802) to provide for the erection of a public building at Poteau, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19803) to provide for the erection of a public building at Hugo, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19804) providing for the holding of the United States district and circuit courts at Ada, Okla.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 19805) for the establishment and maintenance of libraries in the life-saving stations of the United States—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HAGGOTT: A bill (H. R. 19806) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office at Trinidad, Colo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19807) to provide for the granting and patenting to the State of Colorado of certain desert lands within the former Ute Indian Reservation in said State—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 19808) granting an increase of pension to George W. Boner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19809) granting an increase of pension to Frank S. Mathews—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 19810) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Boyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19811) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Boss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19812) granting a pension to Melvin B. Ash—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEDE: A bill (H. R. 19813) granting an increase of pension to D. C. Handy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 19814) granting an increase of pension to Emaline Harvell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALE: A bill (H. R. 19815) granting an increase of pension of Watson Boyden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 19816) granting an increase of pension to Richard P. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 19817) granting a pension to William M. Kilby—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19818) granting a pension to P. J. Giles—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19819) granting a pension to Samuel Reeder—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19820) to provide for the payment of the claim for clerical assistance of F. L. Brenizer, postmaster at Dunn Loring, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19821) for the relief of James Downs and heirs of William Downs, sr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 19822) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARRAGH: A bill (H. R. 19823) granting an increase of pension to James E. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 19824) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Cross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19825) granting an increase of pension to David J. Bishop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19826) granting a pension to Willis S. Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19827) granting a pension to James W. Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



By Mr. FORNES: A bill (H. R. 19828) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOULKROD: A bill (H. R. 19829) for the relief of Charles F. Fairburn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON: A bill (H. R. 19830) granting an increase of pension to James R. Rather—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 19831) granting an increase of pension to Owen M. Higgins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19832) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Campbellsville, Taylor County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HACKETT: A bill (H. R. 19833) granting a pension to Israel Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 19834) for the relief of Martin Ball, heir of Stephen Ball, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 19835) granting an increase of pension to John F. Benjegerdes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 19836) granting a pension to Thomas Conlin—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 19837) granting an increase of pension to John Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 19838) for the relief of Marion B. Patterson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 19839) for the relief of W. H. Blurock—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 19840) granting a pension to Alzina Wilcher—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 19841) for the relief of the heirs of William Southworth, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 19842) for the relief of the legal representatives of Evan Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19843) for the relief of William H. Dotson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19844) granting an increase of pension to Decatur Maynard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANING: A bill (H. R. 19845) granting an increase of pension to Lydia L. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAW: A bill (H. R. 19846) for the relief of Addison M. Davies—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19847) granting an increase of pension to George Hoffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 19848) for the relief of Mrs. Laura Barrett—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 19849) granting an increase of pension to Charles G. Vanness—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 19850) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Briggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19851) granting an increase of pension to Lewis W. Pond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 19852) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Slemph—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of California: A bill (H. R. 19853) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius S. Forgy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOTT: A bill (H. R. 19854) granting a pension to Catharine Barry—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19855) granting an increase of pension to James K. Hamilton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 19856) for the relief of the heirs of A. Lawrence Foster—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 19857) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 19858) granting an increase of pension to Lewis S. Goshorn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: Petition of citizens of New York and vicinity, for relief for heirs of victims of the *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Papers to accompany bills for relief of George W. Bowen and Johnston Haughey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Frank S. Mathews—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Gifford Ramey—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Paper to accompany bill for relief of M. Lewis Blair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: Petitions of Cronomer Valley Grange and Washingtonville Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Orange County, N. Y., for a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE: Petitions of Frank O'Ryan, C. T. Woolsey, E. H. Porter, and C. A. Thomas and others, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of convention of International Seamen's Union of America, held at Portland, Me., March 16, 1908, against S. 5787 (bill to amend Revised Statutes, section 4463)—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: Petition to suspend the service pension act of February 6, 1907, in favor of A. B. Bowen, F. W. Titgemeyer, I. Frericks, and G. King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Watson Boyden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Petition of allied temperance forces of Missouri, represented by Rev. W. B. Palmore, for the Littlefield original-package bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNER: Petition of merchants of Iowa, against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DARRAGH: Petition of L. F. Schermerhorn and 16 other residents of Crooked Lake, Clare County, Mich., for a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Abraham Crass, James W. Sullivan, Willis S. Henderson, and David J. Bishop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Petitions of Grand Army of the Republic posts of Waterville, Farnsworth, Maynard, and St. Peter, all of the State of Minnesota, against abolishment of pension agencies—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petitions of Farmers' Clubs, of Minnesota, and State Association of Builders' Exchange, urging passage of H. R. 534—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Builders' Exchange of St. Paul, opposing passage of Gardner eight-hour bill—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of National Association of Clothiers, favoring passage of Fowler bill—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Jobbers and Manufacturers' Association, favoring \$2,000,000 annual appropriation for improvement of Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Commercial Club of St. Paul, favoring an improvement of Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of St. Paul Live Stock Exchange, favoring passage of H. R. 13841—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Minnesota State Federation of Women's Clubs, for laboratories under Federal and State aid and for scientific study of criminal, pauper, and defective classes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Commercial Club of Faribault, Minn., indorsing H. R. 18204 (Davis industrial high school bill)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOUGLAS: Petition of citizens of Ohio, in favor of a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of Trades League of Philadelphia, for S. 25 and H. R. 6169, to promote efficiency of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Universalist Club, of Haverhill, Mass., for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Paestekill Grange, for H. R. 15837, constituting a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORNES: Petition of Navy-Yard Association, for revision of grades and salaries—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of legislature of State of New York, for a volunteer officers' retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of emergency experiment station of University of Illinois, for H. R. 9230—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of National Clothiers of New York City, against Aldrich currency bill and favoring Fowler bill—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of board of directors of Merchants' Association of New York, against H. R. 15651 (Gardner eight-hour bill)—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of McPherson Post, No. 51; Shiloh Post, No. 60; Sheridan-Dix Post, No. 7; Heintzleman Post, No. 33, and Sedgwick Post, No. 17, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of California, favoring H. R. 220, relative to desecration of the flag—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLET: Petition of citizens of New York and vicinity, for relief for heirs of victims of the *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of Phillipston Grange, No. 70, for a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of Trades League of Philadelphia, against H. R. 7597, for taking Thirteenth Census—to the Committee on the Census.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 1, International Stereotypers and Electrotypers' Union, for removal of duty on white paper, wood pulp, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Massachusetts State Federation of Women's Clubs, for forest reservation in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Universalist Club, of Haverhill, Mass., for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Southern Intelligence Bureau, against prohibition laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Brill Brothers, of New York City, against Aldrich bill—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Maritime Association of Port of New York, for S. 25, to promote efficiency of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Polish organizations and Polish press of the United States, favoring Bates resolution of sympathy for Polish subjects of Prussia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., for S. 25, promoting efficiency in the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petitions of McPherson Post, No. 61; Sedgwick Post, No. 17; Heintzleman Post, No. 33; Shiloh Post, No. 60; and Sheridan-Dix Post, No. 7, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of California, favoring H. R. 220, against desecration of the American flag—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. F. Mehelbreth, a citizen of New York City, favoring the Dick-Capron bill readjusting pay of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Andrew D. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of E. H. Porter, C. A. Thomas, C. T. Woolsey, Frank O'Ryan, and others, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Iowa: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Elkin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASKINS: Petition of Waterbury Grange, No. 237; Caledonia Grange, No. 9, and Green Mountain Grange, No. 347, for H. R. 15837, creation of a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of P. E. Holderness and 74 other citizens of San Jose, Cal., in favor of exclusion of Asiatic laborers and against extending the right of naturalization—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of California, opposing Penrose bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. Beatrice H. Duncan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: Petition of Floyd Thompson, of Chicora, Pa., and others, for a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: Petition of American Newspaper Publishers' Association, for removal of duty on white paper, wood pulp, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: Petitions of Methodist Episcopal Church of Port Orchard, First Congregational Church of

Snohomish, and Fremont Baptist Church, of Seattle, all in the State of Washington, for closing gates to visitors Sundays during the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition—to the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petitions of Methodist Episcopal Church of Port Orchard; Fremont Baptist Church, of Seattle; First Congregational Church of Snohomish, and Methodist Episcopal Church of Burlington, all in the State of Washington, against the sale of intoxicating liquor on any Government property—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Washington, against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LAMB: Paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of William Southworth—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LILLEY: Petition of George W. Ide, for a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of Jobbers and Manufacturers' Association, favoring improvement of the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petition of F. H. Albee and others, for a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Trades League of Philadelphia, for authorization to complete all Government contracts pending in certain shipyards and steel works—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of Kenesaw Bay View Club, of Nebraska, in favor of woman suffrage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PADGETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petitions of Conquest Grange, No. 1027, of Port Byron, N. Y., and Hopewell Grange, No. 472, of Ontario, N. Y., favoring a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia, against the building of new battle ships—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of North American Fish and Game Protective Association, for a treaty with Canada looking to the propagation and protection of fish in the Great Lakes—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of National Association of Clothiers, against the Aldrich and in favor of the Fowler currency bill—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of New York Credit Men's Association, for any amendment beneficial to present bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of Richland Grange, No. 372, for a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of Jobbers and Manufacturers' Association of St. Paul, favoring an improvement of Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Merriam Park Woman's Club, of St. Paul, Minn., for the Beveridge-Parsons child-labor bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Mrs. Bertha Lynch, for the Kittredge copyright bill—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: Petition of S. H. Bromfield and Burton Grange, for a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Presbyterian Church of Orwell, Ohio, for the Littlefield original-package bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. F. Cram and others, for establishment of a rural parcels post, as per S. 5122—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: Petition of Ohio State legislative board of Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, for the La Follette-Sterling employers' liability bill and against the Knox bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of S. A. Horner and other citizens, against the Penrose bill, amendment of section 3893 of the Revised Statutes, S. 1518, creating a press censorship—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Thomas M. Bergan and 20 other citizens of Snedekerville, Bradford County, Pa., against H. R. 19238—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Universalist Club of Haverhill, Mass., for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.



By Mr. WOOD: Petitions of F. L. Sturgeon, C. T. Woolsey, E. S. T. Porter, C. A. Thomas, and Frank O. Ryan, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Board of Trade of Newark, N. J., for a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Trades League of Philadelphia, for S. 25 (efficiency of Life-Saving Service), and H. R. 7597 (to provide for taking the Thirteenth Census)—to the Committee on the Census.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *March 25, 1908.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. MCCREARY, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16882) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GILLET, Mr. BRICK, and Mr. LIVINGSTON managers at the conference on the part of the House.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

S. 3416. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the extension of Meridian place NW," approved January 9, 1907;

H. R. 16493. An act limiting and restricting the right of entry and assignment under the desert-land law and authorizing an extension of time within which to make final proof;

H. R. 16621. An act to extend the time for the construction of a dam across Savannah River at Cherokee Shoals; and

H. R. 19408. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to donate to the Albert Sidney Johnston Camp, Confederate Veterans, of San Antonio, Tex., not to exceed fifty obsolete Springfield rifles, bayonets, and bayonet scabbards for same.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of Local Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Torrington, Conn., remonstrating against the ratification of the pending treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the League of Peace, of New York City, N. Y., praying that an invitation be extended by Congress to the Japanese Parliament to visit the United States in 1909, at a joint interparliamentary union, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PLATT presented a memorial of the Master Steam and Hot Water Fitters' Association of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "anti-injunction bill," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the ratification of the pending treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of Henry S. Creamer, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the present copyright law relating to musical compositions, which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Olean, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called "postal savings bank bill," which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange No. 1072, Patrons of Husbandry, of Binghamton, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to create a national highways commission, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions from Local Grange No. 1042, Patrons of Husbandry, of Clifton Springs; of Local Grange No. 548, Patrons of Husbandry, of Glendale; of Local Grange No.

1072, Patrons of Husbandry, of Binghamton; of Local Grange No. 882, Patrons of Husbandry, of Staatsburg, and of Madison County Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of New York, praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post bill," which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of Stevens Mills Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Auburn, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the appointment of a national highways commission, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CULLOM presented memorials of sundry citizens of Butte and of the Phil Sheridan Club, of Anaconda, in the State of Montana; of the Emmet Club, of Gardner, Mass.; of the Robert Emmet Literary Society, of Seattle, Wash.; of the Henry Grattan Club, of New Haven; of the Emmet Club, of Danbury, in the State of Connecticut; and of the Irish Nationalists, of Cleveland, Springfield, and Cincinnati, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the ratification of the pending treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LONG presented a memorial of the Southern Intelligence Bureau, of New Orleans, La., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Covona, Morganhill, and Oakdale, in the State of California; of South Lancaster, Mass.; of Bennon, Birchtree, Carthage, Clarksburg, Jerico Springs, Mainard, Mendon, Reno, and St. Louis, in the State of Missouri; of Marion and Toledo, in the State of Ohio; of Temple, Okla.; of Gaffney, S. C.; of Nashville, Tenn., and of Hartland, Vt., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to protect the first day of the week as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of Portsmouth Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Portsmouth, R. I., praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post bill," which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the John Mitchell Literary Association, of Providence, R. I., remonstrating against the ratification of the pending arbitration treaty between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Prescott, Colrain, Lyonsville, Adamsville, Middleboro, Gardner, and West Tisbury, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill," which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Atlantic Coast Seamen's Union, of Boston, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to amend section 4463 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the manning of vessels, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WARNER presented a petition of sundry allied temperance organizations of Sedalia, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the International Reform Bureau of Washington, D. C., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the present antigambling law of the District of Columbia, so as to prohibit gambling and bookmaking in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. RAYNER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Burtonville and Silver Springs, in the State of Maryland, praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post bill," which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. ANKENY presented a petition of sundry citizens of South Bend, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the giving to or receipt by public officers of any free frank or privilege for the transmission of messages by telegraph or telephone and to prevent discriminations in interstate telegraph and telephone rates, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HOPKINS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Earlville, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill," which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the con-